

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1900.

ARTICLE I. HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY REV. PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

Higher Criticism is an important and indispensable tool in the work-shop of the student of God's Word. The deserved ill repute in which it stands at present in conservative, theological and churchly circles is the natural and necessary outcome, not of its legitimate use, but of its abuse, consisting in the control of its methods and manners and results by certain philosophical principles that are inconsistent with the character and the contents of the Scriptures. The science has also been unfortunate in the name by which it has in recent years become known. "Higher Criticism"—really only a new name for an old discipline—is not so-called because, properly conducted, it is in possession of certain esoteric principles and processes for the discovery of truths and history in reference to the origin and growth of the biblical books and their historical back-ground not accessible to the ordinary Bible reader, but this term aims only to note the next higher step in the study of the Bible books following upon lower or textual criticism. Logically the latter must precede the former, and hence the two names, lower and higher criticism. For besides, lower criticism was the subject of sharp antagonism as is the case in reference to higher now. The tens of thousands of variants in the New Testament manuscripts, before their true lesson was learned, worried Bible students as much as the documentary theory of the Pentateuch

and other Old Testament books do now. Naturally the matter of the text must be settled first, and the original readings of the first writers restored, if necessary, before the literary and historical study, of which Higher Criticism really consists, can be thought of. In this inner relation of the two sides of the study of the biblical books lies the reason and the justification of the two appellations: "Lower" and "Higher Criticism." In reality, one is neither lower nor higher than the other. And in this connection it should not be forgotten that some of the objectionable features in the current criticism of the day are really attributable not to higher but to lower criticism. If, *e. g.*, the doxology of the Lord's Prayer is omitted; the pericope of the woman caught in adultery; the trinity passage in John, and the like, this is really in compliance with the demands of lower criticism. It has been found that in certain leading manuscripts such passages are not found, and accordingly the best textual criticism of the New Testament seems to demand their omission.

In fact, the name "Higher Criticism," is rarely if ever applied to the science under discussion by its friends and by those who carefully and cautiously make use of the discipline as the best interests of Bible research demands. It is rather a term of reproach applied by those who are opposed to the present type of biblical scholarship that operates chiefly in this department. The best term for the discipline doubtlessly would be "historical" or "literary" criticism, or still better "historico-literary criticism," as its principles and methods really combine both the historical and the inner critical study of a literary production. For, it should not be forgotten that this kind of study, employed for the purpose of determining the real contents and teachings of a book, is not confined to the Scriptures at all. Higher Criticism is in fact employed in the interpretation of any literary production, and must be, wherever thoroughness and exactness is to be allowed. If, *e. g.*, the student of Herodotus examines the writings of this historian in the light of what is known of the countries he describes and then tests them as to their degree of probability and their probable literary history, this process is nothing but Higher Criticism. If again, the reader of Cicero's

letters studies the times and the historical surroundings of these writings and also their style, their contents, etc., for the purpose of understanding their real lessons, this again is nothing but Higher Criticism. The legitimate and necessary evidence of such a discipline in the interests of exact research, both in the biblical and other departments, is practically self-evident. Nor is it denied by even the most determined opponents of the common and current biblical criticism of the times. Professor Green, of Princeton, was a higher critic in the real sense of the term just as much as is Professor Wellhausen, whose teachings he so strongly antagonized, but in the application of the science the former rejected far-reaching subjective principles, and methods that in the work of the latter are the all-controlling factors and forces. Indeed to Higher Criticism the Church has been indebted for some of its best work. When Luther and his friends, on the basis of historical and inner reasons, rejected the Old Testament Apocrypha as not a legitimate portion of God's Word and accordingly not binding on the conscience of the Christian, they simply acted as higher critics and the whole Protestant Church in accepting the conclusion of the Reformer have endorsed this act. Luther's doubts as to the character of James, the apocalypse of John, of Hebrews, are well known, and his right to study these books with this object in view none can deny, however we may be disinclined to share his hesitancy.

It is for this reason that as long as this discipline is kept within its legitimate bounds there need be no substantial disagreement as to its teachings and tenets. Merely as a literary and historical study-investigation of the biblical books there are no reasons why this agreement should not exist, as it may exist in the literary and historical study of Homer, Dante, or Shakespeare. Only then, when on the basis of such literary and historical study, a constructive or reconstructive scheme as to the religious process these books describe, is made, into which, *ab extra*, principles are introduced that have nothing to do with the critical study—only then does the great chasm appear that separates totally and entirely the believing from the unbelieving, the conservative from the radical critics. Nobody can object to the

newer criticism simply because it teaches a documentary theory in reference to the Pentateuch and claims that these books are a composite from various older writings. Such a view is perfectly consistent with the claims of these books to being the production of a Moses and having been revealed by Jehovah. We know now better than ever before, especially through the Tel-el-Amarna and other archaeological finds in Egypt and in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, that long before the times of the Exodus literature and letters flourished throughout Western Asia, and that it would be surprising not that Moses did make use of older writings in the composition of the five books, as such earlier documents were confessedly used in Kings, Chronicles and other writings of the Old Testament, but the surprise would be, if he had *not* made use of such sources. In fact merely the literary substratum of the higher Criticism schemes in reference to the Old Testament need not be objectionable, unless it be from the standpoint of literary criticism. Theology has no special interests in maintaining a documentary or a non-documentary theory as such in reference to the books of Moses. But when the next step is taken, and on the basis of such a literary substratum a superstructure is erected, into the building material of which is introduced a mass and multitude of hay and stubble of human theory, figment and philosophy, then the earnest student of God's Word must rise and protest. And just at this point lies the great objectionable work of what is called Higher Criticism, but really is only subjective hypothesis construction. The whole modern biblical school in its radical and most representative elements is dominated by the philosophical idea of natural development. As the veteran Delitzsch said shortly before his death, the modern school aims to introduce into the Old Testament especially "the religion of the era of Darwin." In common with much of the teachings of that new but mischievous science Comparative Religion, a regular Pandora box of oddities and crudities, in religious thought, modern criticism sees in the Old Testament religious history a gradual development, not of divine revelation of the plan of salvation for lost men as the New Testament and the Church

have taught all along, but rather of the natural religious instincts of the Israelitish people, who possessed a natural aptitude of religion in the same way in which the Greeks were endowed for philosophical thought and the Romans for administrative work. In other words, the newer criticism practically aims at abolishing Jehovah from Israel's history as the special and controlling factor in this development. As Kuenen, one of the most open and consistent representatives of this school, openly teaches, the "religion of Israel is one of the greatest religions of the world, nothing less *but also nothing more*." The unique element, the divine element as a special and characteristic feature, is thus naturally eliminated, or would be, if this principle were consistently carried out. The degree of radicalism displayed in the researches of a Bible critic of modern times depends on the extent to which this radical naturalistic or at least naturalizing principle is applied and enforced. That under its spell and influence all differences between inspired and uninspired books disappear, goes without saying. For this reason, it is only natural that Stade, in his characteristic "*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*," regards the apocrypha and the apocalypses of the inter-Testament period as equally good and reliable sources for determining the religious history and status of the old covenant people as are the canonical books.

It is really this underlying philosophical principle of natural development that has determined the whole reconstructive scheme of modern biblical criticism in its radical, more radical and most radical phases. Accordingly the books and their contents found in the Old Testament are not the revelations of God through his appointed servants, but are rather the documentary evidence of the religious stages through which Israel's history had developed. The laws of the Pentateuch are accordingly not regarded as having been given for the purpose of instructing the people as to their religious duties, but are only the codification of the religious laws that had in the course of time been introduced by the people themselves. They existed in fact, before they existed in writing, and the historical process is thus simply inverted.

And what is the case in reference to the Pentateuch is also true of the rest of the Old Testament. Particularly is this true of the prophets. The second part of Isaiah, Chap. 40-66, are denied to the Isaiah of history and are attributed to a "great Unknown" prophet of the Exilic period, for the simple reason that the historical surroundings of Isaiah's period do not furnish the material for the natural explanation of the genesis and contents of the magnificent prophecies. It matters not if the New Testament, with Christ and the apostles at the head, takes a different view of the whole Old Testament religion and on particular problems with reference to authorship, date, etc., of certain books or portions, the newer criticism will acknowledge no such authority, and prefers to believe that even the Saviour was held by the popular prejudices of his times in reference to the sacred books of the Jews. This condition of affairs shows to what a wonderful degree the naturalistic principle has control of the newer critical school. It acknowledges not the authority of Christ or of his Apostles or of the New Testament, but only the authority of Darwin and his philosophy of natural development.

It is accordingly then the abuse and not the use of Higher Criticism, unfortunately so-called—that the Church and all true students of God's Word must antagonize. It would be worse than folly to oppose what element of truth may underlie the tenets of this critical school, the exaggeration and misrepresentation and misapplication, of what element of truth constitutes its stock in trade. In some respects the Church is under obligation to the modern criticism, especially in having emphasized as never before, the historical side of the Scriptures. The failure to do so was manifestly a weakness in the biblical studies of the Fathers, also of the Lutheran Church, and this failure has appeared especially in the inability to appreciate the prophecies and predictions of the Old Testament in their proper historical settings and in the inclination to make them mere *dicta probantia* without special historical cause or purpose. That the Scriptures are not only a revelation but also the history of a revelation is really a valuable acquirement of modern Bible research, and has contributed to the understanding of certain details of

biblical subjects to a noteworthy degree. The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the predominantly negative shape in which it is put by the great apostle, directing it as he does against the dogma of justification by the merits of the law, becomes all the more plain at least in form if not materially, by understanding the historical background of the New Testament, especially the legalistic teachings of the official Jewish theology of the times when Paul was called upon to combat. It is again the abuse of this principle, current in itself, that constitutes the objectionable feature in its application in modern criticism. If these historical forces are made the sole or chief cause of the teachings of the New Testament, as is done to a greater or less degree by the critics, then again this religious development becomes a purely naturalistic process and the inspired character of the sacred books and of the religious development they portray is actually lost.

The cardinal sin of modern Higher Criticism consists then in this, that the literary and historical analysis of the biblical books is put entirely under the control of the philosophical idea of natural development, and that then these books, *nolens volens*, are made to teach a religious scheme that is absolutely contradictory to their own claims, to the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, to the very nature of this Christian religion and the convictions of the Church at large in all generations and ages.

And what is the present status of this criticism? The coolest and most deliberate judgment of observers must be that it has passed its zenith and is on the decline. Its spread has never been what it was supposed to be. In Germany, the breeding place and headquarters of all the newer phases of theological research, good and bad, it has practically been confined to the universities and to the circles under university influence. It has not found its way into the Church at large, to a noteworthy degree. Evidences of this fact abound. When several years ago Professor Harnack advocated the abolition of the Apostles' Creed from the liturgical and confessional use of the churches, Protestant Germany arose almost to a man against the innovation. In fact, the Church at large in the land of Luther is much

better than its reputation for orthodox and positive evangelical faith. As a rule, the pastors, when they enter upon their duties in the congregations, quietly discard the teachings of the university professors on the subject of the Scriptures, finding them inconsistent with their duties to the congregations. There actually exists a chasm between the theologies of the universities and those of the churches at large. The former do not fairly represent the latter, and there is constant antagonism between them. At Bonn, Marburg, Berlin, Tübingen and other universities, the demands of the conservative church factor have compelled the authorities to appoint conservative professors, especially in the biblical departments, to counteract the influence of the radicals and teach a theology that can be used on the pulpit as well as in the lecture hall. No one knows better than the university professors that their influence is lost to a notable degree in the pulpits and the pews, and for this reason they have in recent years inaugurated the scheme of "vacation lecture" courses, where pastors are invited to come and hear of the latest results of critical research. The plan can not be said to have been a success.

Nor has the popularizing of the newer criticism in other countries, notably England and America, led to a consistent adoption of its teachings and tenets by large masses. It is fair to believe that many ministers too, who think they have embraced the new wisdom, have really not done so, being unacquainted with what is logically and consistently involved. The newer criticism has not entranced the multitudes anywhere.

The universities, especially of Germany, are indeed under its spell and dominion; but not in its radical shape. There is indeed not a single theological professor in all of the twenty famous universities of the Fatherland, who will accept that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, even in its main elements, or that Isaiah wrote the second part of the book of Isaiah, or that Daniel wrote the book that bears his name, but it is equally true that not a few of the Old Testament men, and usually those who lecture to the largest number of students, do not accept the radical reconstructive scheme so popular in certain circles. On

purely literary subjects, even so far as the placing of the Levitical laws into the period of Ezra, there is a general agreement; but not on the naturalistic hypothesis of Israel's religious history. This prominent men like König of Bonn, von Orelli of Basel, Oettli of Kiel, Volck of Rostock and others emphatically reject. There is indeed not a single university professor in Germany, unless it be Nösgen, the New Testament man of Rostock, who accepts the literal inspiration of the Scriptures and believes these books to be without error or mistake; but between the moderate adherents of the literary phases of the Higher Criticism, and the adherents of the radical naturalism, there is really a difference not of degree but of kind. Between them there exists, as Delitzsch says, a "deep chasm."

But even in the matter of literature problems a determined effort is made to undermine the newer school. This has been done most successfully and thoroughly in the department of New Testament research by Professor Th. Zahn, of Erlangen, the prince of scholars in this line, in his magnificent and massive two volume work, entitled "Introduction to the New Testament," of which the second edition has already been called for. With a mastery of details never before seen, Zahn has here demolished the whole structure of destructive New Testament criticism, and vindicated throughout the Church's conviction concerning the New Testament writings. For fully two decades this conservative reaction has been in progress in the New Testament sphere and has reached its acme in Zahn's work. In the Old Testament things are not yet in so favorable a condition, but it does not require a prophet or a prophet's son to foretell that an equally successful reaction has been inaugurated and will be completed. A number of names of prominence appear already, but none as great as that of Zahn. Professor Green's work in this direction is much appreciated also in Germany where the main defenders of the old landmarks have been Pastor Rupprecht and Pastor Ad. Zahn, recently deceased, of Stuttgart. The former in his three volume work, "*Der Rätsel's Lösung*," has furnished the best argument advanced against the

literary substratum of the whole critical school, and his *Einleitung* to the New Testament is good as far as it goes, but is not exhaustive. Other men like Strack, Naumann, *et al.*, could also be mentioned here, going to show that the newer criticism in Germany is meeting with considerable opposition in Germany too. But as yet much preparatory and special work on detail problems remains to be done, before a general and crushing work can be prepared like that of Zahn on the New Testament. One of the most significant signs in this direction is the fact that the underlying principle of the newer school, namely, the subjective at the expense of the traditional is gradually losing advocates. Harnack acknowledges that renewed emphasis must be placed on the traditional information at the disposal of scholars with reference to the Scriptures and the early history of the Church, and now declares that the development of forty years after the death of Christ would be sufficient to explain the whole historical development and literature of the New Testament. This is a determined attack on the subjectivism so characteristic and potent in modern biblical scholarship, which has been overriding all principles, reasons or considerations. If subjective methods and manners are no longer made the measure of all things, much will have been gained for a better kind and a fairer method of biblical investigation.

It thus appears that the subjective and naturalistic spirit of modern radical biblical study has been responsible for the untold evils that practically undermine the divine character of the Scriptures and their contents as a revelation; and that a sober second thought is making itself felt, which in part has led and in other respects promises still further to lead back theological research to better foundations and safer moorings. That these radical and rationalistic researches have been without benefit or profit, it would be foolish to assert. In fact they have done good. The New Testament books never were so entrenched in historical truth as they are now, had they not been so bitterly attacked by Baur and the Tübingen school. When the fiery ordeal of the Wellhausen furnace is a thing of the past, the Old Testament will appear better than ever before as the word of the liv-

ing God. The Church has passed through such periods before, as witnesses the time of vulgar rationalism, and every time both the Church and the Scriptures have profited by the process. *Magna est veritas et praevalebit.*

ARTICLE II.

LUTHER AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

By PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

[CONCLUDED FROM VOL. XXX., P. 399.]

LUTHER'S REMONSTRANCES.

Copies of the Articles of Concord proposed by the two halves of the Committee of Fourteen were promptly sent to Luther by the Elector of Saxony with the request that he render an opinion on them.* Melancthon also wrote to Luther, August 22nd, and gave him the chief points in the negotiations.† Luther replied, August 26th. His letter to the Elector is a masterful *exposé* of the poison, deceit and danger that lie concealed in the Articles. As it shows how clearly Luther comprehended the situation at Augsburg, and how firmly he maintained his position against the chief corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church, we give it in full:

"Grace and Peace in Christ. Illustrious, High-born Prince, Most Gracious Elector and Lord:

"I have received your letter together with copies from both parts of the Committee. Now inasmuch as Your Grace desires my opinion on the same, I will herewith obediently render it.

"The conditions and methods proposed by them and accepted by ours are by no means to be tolerated; and I am supremely astonished that such things should have been proposed. As regards the Articles from our side, this is my judgment: When our opponents desire us to teach that one form of the Sacrament is right, and that it shall not be enjoined but left free to

*Coelestin, III., 52a.

†C. R., II., 299.

use one or both forms, Your Grace knows very well that it is our chief contention that nothing must be taught, or done, that is not clearly in accord with God's word; lest, as Paul says, we run in vain and beat the air. We have trouble enough even when we go according to and abide by the sure word. It is certain that the doctrine about one form of the Sacrament is a pure human invention, and is not at all supported by the word of God. But on the contrary the use of both forms is established by the clear words of God. Hence we cannot either approve or teach that the use of one form is right. For there stands Christ, Matt. 15 : 9: *Ye serve me with the doctrines of men.*

"Besides, in using only one form we treat the words of Christ with indifference, where he so heartily and earnestly enjoins: *Do this in remembrance of me.* Even they themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. For on account of this they have burned, hounded and persecuted many, and have condemned it as a great heresy. Hence not only on God's account, and our own, but for their sake, we must not allow that it is a matter of indifference. We must regard them as murderers and scoundrels, since, forsooth, they have persecuted and condemned an indifferent thing as a heresy. They themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. Much less can we so teach. Let them recall and bring back all they have persecuted for this cause. It is a very fine complaint they make, viz., that they cannot hold the people where we do not preach that they are right. I am delighted to hear such a wise reason. It is as though God must allow his word to be preached in order that they may hold their people and remain tyrants.

"Of Private Masses I say the same: They are the invention of men, are without support from God's word, and are an abuse. Our opponents do not strive to compel us to restore these, but only not to forbid them. We do not prevent such, but we cannot approve them. If one human invention be admitted, then another must be admitted. That is the way it goes. If we allow the Private Masses, then forthwith we must drop the Gospel and accept a human invention; for there is no reason why one,

and not all human inventions, should be received. To forbid and condemn all is to forbid and condemn one.

"They pretend that it is not the function of rulers to prevent such things. They know very well that the office of ruling and the office of the ministry are not one and the same, and that Princes have nothing to do with such things. But the question is whether a Prince as a Christian will approve this, and not whether he acts as a Prince. Whether a Prince should preach, and whether he should approve preaching, are different matters. It is not the Prince, but the Scripture, that disapproves of Private Masses. It is in the power of the Prince to say whether he will allow the Scriptures or not. No man on earth can force him to do it.

"Should the Canon be allowed with a proper interpretation? Yes, provided it be placed in the hands of safe expounders. Long ago I might have undertaken to explain the religion of the Turks, and to reduce all kinds of unbelief to the Christian faith. It is well known that they have sold the Masses as a sacrifice and a work. Now they would explain them. In a word it is a human invention, such as cannot be tolerated in the affairs of God. Besides, it is dangerous and vexatious. And since they do not abstain from Private Masses, and do not agree with us in regard to the Mass, viz., that it is not a sacrifice, why do they wish to retain the offensive word, seeing that it is unnecessary and dangerous? We should not unnecessarily expose ourselves to danger, for this is forbidden, and it is to tempt God. St. Augustine says: *Maintain the doctrine, but correct the language.* Speaking of fate he says, he that understands fate as the decree of God, understands it aright. Yet he will not tolerate the word, but says: *Correct the language.* Shall we adopt an obscure and uncertain word when we find it hard to maintain those that are clear and plain?

"And what advantage is there in retaining the word *sacrifice* in the Canon? The Canon so plainly declares the Mass to be a true sacrifice, that no man can explain or understand it otherwise. For it is stated that God by the hand of his angel will have such a sacrifice of the Mass brought up before the holy

altar. This cannot be explained as meaning a memorial of the sufferings of Christ, for this must be done by preaching. In a word, in the Canon the prayer is made that God will accept this sacrifice, since it is the body and blood of his dear Son, as though a man must intercede for Christ with God. That is blasphemous and infamous: Hence the Canon is not to be tolerated.

"Finally. We will suffer everything and make concessions so far as that is in our power. But we pray that they will not demand of us what is not in our power. But it is not in our power to accept anything contrary to God's word; and it is not in our power to accept a form of worship that is contrary to God's word. Fasts and festivals instituted by men we can accept in so far as they have been established by the civil government as a civil ordinance; for all such things belong to the secular power, which is adorned with ceremonies, robes, gestures, fasts and festivals. Such things God subordinated to reason, and has enjoined that they be treated as optional matters. Gen. 2. They are earthly things, and their nature is earthly, and they are all subordinated to reason, as Paul said: *Rule over the earth*. Now inasmuch as the civil government is the highest work of reason, it can act and command in these matters.

"Such is my answer given in haste to Your Princely Grace's inquiries. I commend Your Princely Grace to the favor of God. Friday after Bartholomew (August 26th), anno 1530.

"Obediently,

MARTIN LUTHER, D."*

On the same day Luther wrote to Spalatin as follows: "I am sorry to learn that you have begun a marvelous work, namely, the reconciliation of the Pope and Luther. But the Pope refuses, and Luther begs to be excused. Take care lest your labor be in vain. If you succeed against the will of both of us, then I will follow your example and will reconcile Christ and Beliel."†

He also wrote to Melancthon the same day: "Grace and

*De Wette, IV., 140-3.

†De Wette, IV., 144.

Peace in Christ. If the matter was to end in this way, My Philip, I am astonished that they could tolerate that Committee, and could try to treat of the matter in a friendly way. Is there not indeed guile and treachery there? You now have to do with Cochleus, with the Archbishop of Saltzburg and with those ghostly monks who were rowed across the Rhine at Spires.* What is there that I have ever less hoped for, less desired, than to negotiate for agreement in doctrine? It would be like driving out the Pope, or as though our doctrine and the papacy could be conserved together. There is the semblance of a treaty, and of an alliance, in order that the Pope may remain. He is willing to concede and to permit, provided we obey. But thanks to God, you have not accepted these things.

"You write that you forced Eck to confess that we are justified by faith. Would that you had forced him not to lie. Eck, forsooth, confesses that there is the righteousness of faith. But meanwhile the papacy defends every kind of abomination, kills, persecutes, and condemns those who profess the doctrine of faith; and instead of repenting, it goes on. The same is done by the entire party of the adversaries. Seek for terms of concord with these people (*si Christo placet*), and toil in vain until they get a chance to destroy us.

"What you write about both species is correct. I agree with you that it is not a matter of indifference, but a command to take both species if we wish to take the Sacrament. In the Church of God and in the worship of God we cannot arbitrarily either institute or tolerate what cannot be defended by the word of God, and I am not a little annoyed by this sacrilegious word indifferent; for by this word I might easily render all the laws and institutions of God indifferent. Admit one thing in the word of God to be indifferent, how will you hinder everything from becoming indifferent? They cry and vociferate that we condemn the entire Church. We say that the Church has been led captive, and has been oppressed by the tyranny of one species, and hence is to be excused, just as the entire synagogue

*See *Historia de Spectris Spirensibus*, Schirmmacher, 194-6.

in Babylon was excused, because it could not observe the law of Moses in ecclesiastical rites and in its sacraments, as it could in Jerusalem. Nor did they cease to be the people of God, because, as captives and forbidden, they did not observe the rites enjoined upon them. But Eck wants himself and his to be proclaimed the Church. We on the contrary say that we do not condemn the entire Church, but that in mutilating the sacrament they condemn the entire word of God (which is more than the Church).

"As touching the rendering of obedience to the Bishops, and as touching jurisdiction and common ceremonies, as you write, see that you do not yield more than you have yielded, lest in defending the gospel we be forced to a more difficult and dangerous war. I know you have always made an exception of the gospel in these agreements. But I fear that hereafter they will charge that we are perfidious and fickle if we do not do as they wish. They will accept our concessions *large, largius, largissime*, and will make their own *stricte, strictius, strictissime*.

"In a word, I am out-and-out displeased with the *tractatus de doctrinae concordia*, since such is plainly impossible, unless the Pope is willing to put away his popery. Was it not enough that we gave an account of our faith, and seek peace? Why should we hope to convert them to the truth? We came for the purpose of hearing whether or not they would approve our position, but willing to allow them to remain what they are. We inquire, Will they condemn or will they justify? If they condemn, what profit is there in wishing to try to have agreement with enemies? If they justify what need is there to want to retain the old abuses? But since it is certain that we are condemned by them, and that they do not repent, but try to retain their own affairs, why do we not understand that all that they attempt is deceit and lies? For you cannot say that their affairs proceed from the Holy Spirit, since such things are destitute of repentance, of faith, of piety. But the Lord who began this work in us will perfect it. To him I heartily commend you. August 26th, 1530. MARTIN LUTHER."*

*De Wette, IV., 145.

He wrote also the same day to Justus Jonas: "Grace and Peace. I have seen and read the decisions of yours as touching our cause. What I wrote to Philip, that I write you, namely, that in fealty to Christ, and for my sake, as I am a Christian, you and all ours believe that Campeggius is one big notorious devil. Words cannot express how vehemently I am excited about those terms proposed by the other party, so that the demons are ridiculing and mocking our cross. This is the trick of Campeggius and the Pope, first to try our cause by violence and threats, and if this does not succeed, then to assail it with deceit and treachery. You have experienced violence and threats, and you bore the terrible advent of the Emperor. Now you are bearing treachery and those ghostly monks that were rowed across the Rhine at Spires. That is, they are proposing harmony in doctrine. This is a mystery indeed. What but violence and deceit could you expect from the father of deceit and lies, the author of death and violence? But he who gave you power to overcome violence, will give grace and strength to overcome deceit. Of these things I have written to the Prince and to Philip. The messenger must return in haste. Quit ye like men. Don't trust the adversaries, except they prove their position by plain Scripture. The Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen. From the Hermitate. August 26th, 1530.

MARTIN LUTHER." *

In these letters Luther employs argument, irony and denunciation in order to express his opposition to the Articles proposed for the reunion of the Protestants with the Catholics. He simply will not tolerate such Articles. They are in conflict with the fundamental principles of the gospel. It is Luther *versus* the Pope; it is the word of God *versus* the institutions of men; it is Christ *versus* Beliel. There could be no reconciliation along such lines. The point of contact was wanting. And as evidence of Luther's abiding and growing opposition to the Articles of agreement, we have his letters of August 28th to Spalatin, Melancthon and Jonas, in which he warns,

*De Wette, IV., 147-8.

in the strongest language, against the wiles of the enemy and against the making of further concessions.* About this time also he wrote an "Opinion,"† in which he instructs his colleagues at Augsburg about concessions to the enemy. As touching the doctrinal articles of the Confession nothing is to be yielded, inasmuch as such Articles are founded on Holy Scripture, and have not been refuted by the adversaries. He then takes up the various subjects contained in the Articles on Abuses.

In the matter of both species in the Eucharist, he declares that nothing can be conceded, since no man can change an institution of God, neither "can we teach in our churches that those do not sin, nor act contrary to the command of God, who either administer or receive only one species." "The marriage of priests we neither can nor ought to prohibit, since it was instituted, appointed and confirmed by God." "We cannot allow Private Mass to be restored or celebrated in our churches, since everybody knows that it is an idolatry and an abuse." "We distinctly declare that we cannot receive and approve either the Small or the Large Canon, since in express terms they make of the Mass a work by which grace and the remission of sins are bestowed *ex opere operato* upon the priest and upon the lay worshipper." He is willing that the cloister-people shall remain in the cloisters and have food and shelter, but their Masses and their ungodly manner of life shall not be tolerated. He thinks the episcopal jurisdiction might be allowed, provided the Bishops will not seek to persecute and to exterminate the Lutheran doctrine. Meats and festivals can not be allowed to burden the conscience.

The "Opinion," of which we have presented only the salient features, is a trenchant criticism of the concessions made by the Protestants in the Committee of Fourteen. It shows that its author is out-and-out opposed to making any more concessions than had been made already in the Confession; and his reasons for rejecting the Abuses are even stronger and clearer than those given in the Confession itself. Luther, who had taken no part

*De Wette, IV., 755-8.

†Erl. Ausg., 65 : 46 et seqq.

in the preparation of the Confession after April 22nd, and had in the earlier days of the Diet been little more than an interested on-looker, has now stepped to the front, and has assumed command of the Protestant forces at Augsburg. This is further shown by the letter which he wrote to Lazarus Spengler of Nuremberg who had complained to Luther about the concessions made at Augsburg: "I have commended the cause to God, and have it so well in hand that no man will force me to yield anything; nor can I be deserted so long as Christ and I are one. For though too much has been conceded (for this I was not prepared), yet the cause is not lost, but a new conflict has been begun, in which our opponents will be convinced that they have acted dishonorably. For besides and beyond the gospel nothing can be conceded, no matter which party holds the field by guile."*

REMONSTRANCE OF THE NURENBERGERS.

August 23rd the Nuremberg legates, Kress and Baumgartner, sent a copy of the Articles of Agreement to their senate.† Immediately was this laid before the city council and the theologians, and on the 26th a "*Judicium et Censura*" was returned with instructions that it be laid before the Elector of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg.‡ In the letter of instructions the Nurembergers express their displeasure that so much had been done behind their backs and behind the backs of other allies of the Protestant cause. They dread the displeasure of the Princes, but they must be true to God, to their own consciences and to their own souls. They say that they can by no means approve the concessions that have been made. The "*Judicium et Censura*" is as follows:

"The Senate of Nuremberg has, so far as the shortness of the time would permit, carefully read and considered the document lately put forth at Augsburg by committees appointed by the papal party, and has had the same considered by its theologians. We find that the document contains three classes of articles.

*De Wette, IV., 158.

†C. R., II., 301.

‡The letter is printed in *Mitteilungen des Vereins fuer Geschichte der Stadt Nuremberg, Viertes Heft*, p. 36.

"First, those on which the Committee agreed, and which have not hitherto been the subject of controversy. These we now pass by.

"Secondly, those articles which have been hitherto the subjects of controversy, and have not yet been agreed upon. In regard to these it is right, Christian and proper that those things should be firmly maintained which ours have publicly preached and which they have set forth in the Confession as true and Christian.

"Thirdly, those articles which in part are matters of doubt, and in part subjects of controversy.

"In regard to the controverted articles, or as quite recently they have been called, the doubtful articles, the Senate and its theologians, and beyond a doubt other Christian people, are of the opinion that in that document much has been yielded, granted and conceded to the Papists, which either wounds the conscience, and cannot be sustained by Scripture, or which will bring evil and scandal upon those who have hitherto preferred Christ and his gospel. Some of these articles and their objectionable features we will briefly indicate :

"First. It would be not a little inconvenient for pious rulers to obligate themselves, and to agree, to allow the monks, nuns, and cloisters to remain in their pristive condition, and to use the ceremonies that have been in vogue among them. For in many places it would follow that the old *Patrocinia*, preaching, impious masses, fraternities, funeral rites, and many like things would be restored in the cloisters, and would allure and seduce innocent people. And by the diversity of ceremonies such confusion would be introduced, that among the common people, especially in large communities, nothing but constant sedition could be expected, to say nothing about the things arising from the same source, that would be silently tolerated.

"Secondly. It is not well, and it will in no small degree promote error, to concede to the Papists, as they have hitherto taught, that there are three parts in repentence. For there is no doubt that by confession, the Papists mean auricular confession (*Ohrenbeicht*), and by satisfaction, the satisfaction of works.

Now let every one consider, if these two parts be conceded to them as necessary parts of repentance, how much they would thereby gain; and let every one consider whether the word of God and the Holy Scripture can allow this. Or should the matter be glossed, and explained differently from what the Papists understand it, yet it will never be understood by the common people otherwise than according to the papal sense.

"Thirdly. If the communion is to be administered to no one who has not previously made oral confession, then the way will be opened for scruples and errors. But it would be perilous to bind the communion absolutely to confession, and to bind the people to confession. What would this be except to bind the conscience again to oral confession, to which no one should be again bound by compulsion or necessity? This would also be to restore the papal torments, and it would force the people on the day of communion and at some particular time to confess at the whim of the pastors.

"Fourthly. The article about fasts, the eating and the abstaining from flesh, is perfectly ridiculous and detrimental. For thus the people would be forced against their will again to observe quadragesimal and other festival days. Thus Christian liberty, under the guise of maintaining peace and unity, would be destroyed. Christian liberty as likewise every other article of faith, we ought to maintain, as Paul commands. Abandon Christian liberty, and institute necessity, and the Papists will have it all their own way.

"Fifthly. There is no Scripture to be found anywhere that teaches, or that allows us to infer, that deceased saints, or the angels in heaven, pray to God for us. Also there is no mediator, intercessor, or high priest before God, as all Scripture shows, except Christ alone. What use is there then, what advantage do we have, from conceding and yielding this article to the Papists, which they have tried to base on the Scriptures, but of which the Scriptures have not a trace? And every intelligent person knows well what abuses have followed gradually from this article.

"Sixthly. In this a larger jurisdiction has been granted and conceded to the Bishops than they themselves have hitherto ever demanded, or have ever had. Should this article be established, then no more subtle and direct way of utterly wiping out the gospel in a short time, could be thought of. For if, as heretofore, the Bishops should have full power over the priests; if the Bishops by virtue of their episcopal authority are to be able unhindered to punish delinquent priests; if the pastors and priests are to be presented to the Bishops, as this article unqualifiedly proposes without any limitation of the episcopal power, what else will follow, or what is to be expected, except that the Bishops will never permit a truly Christian pastor to be presented? Or should they allow such a one to be presented, they will be forever making charges against him, or will be otherwise interfering with him, so that he cannot remain. Or what pastor would expose himself to such perils, or would preach, if there be no appeal to the rulers for protection against the Bishops, and if he had nothing but death and ruin to expect? How could the rulers answer before God and their own consciences for their subjects? But if the preachers should be thus harassed, arrested, persecuted, expelled, how long would the Gospel and the Christian religion remain? And how could the Papists offer a more subtle contrivance to the Christian Estates for deferring the articles about which there is dispute to a future council, than by having them accept this article of the Jurisdiction of the Bishops? For in this way they have hit upon a method and plan by which they can quickly overthrow the Gospel together with the preachers and pastors, so that it can never again be defended according to law and reason, against the Emperor, the Empire and the allied Estates.

"Finally. Such are the difficulties and objectionable features arising from several articles and from several passages in the document submitted. Should this document be accepted, consciences will be wounded, and a large part of the papal abuses will be confirmed, the Gospel will be held in contempt, the Evangelical Estates will be regarded as apostates, the Scriptures

will be neglected, things will be done contrary to the Scriptures in many ways, and one evil will beget another."*

With additional words and arguments the Senate remonstrates and warns against the concessions that have been made, and further points out the evil consequences that must result from a reunion on such a basis. In a word, the *Judicium et Censura* is a clear and pronounced condemnation of the Articles of Agreement made by the Joint Committee. The evangelical consciousness of the Nurenbergers has been fairly outraged.

OTHER REMONSTRANCES.†

1. Dr. Geryon Seiler, of Augsburg, an ardent friend of the Reformation, hearing of the concessions that had been made by the Protestant Committee, wrote a most earnest and trenchant letter to Spalatin, about August 20th or 21st. We can give only its salient points:

(a). In the proscription of marriage to the priests "the Evangelicals have not considered the interest of Christ and his kingdom, but their own interest."

(b). If the communion is to be received under one species only, "why has it been so bitterly contended that communion under one species is contrary to the Gospel?" "If for the sake of peace one species is to be conceded, then for the sake of peace, neither species ought to be taken."

(c). "Though the Mass is a memorial sacrifice, yet the Canon would have to be tolerated, and the words oblation, host, sacrifice, would have to be understood not as of a memorial." He insists on the removal of the Canon of the Mass, because it introduces a mode of worship that is contrary to the word of God. "Would not all Lutherans and Evangelicals cry out that those things have now been brought to ruin that hitherto were preached by their leaders? Such union would be like drawing a cloud over the sun. You say this must be endured for the sake of peace. Paul did not so love peace as to circumcise both Titus

*German in Chytraeus (1577), p. 173 *et seqq.* Latin in Coelestin III., 81 *et seqq.* Chytraeus, 297 *et seqq.*

†See Schmidt's *Philipp Melancthon*, p. 231 *et seqq.*

and Timothy. He circumcised the one out of deference to the weak, but he refused to circumcise the other when he saw that it would bring prejudice to the faith. But the Papists are not weak. Rather are they blind. Hence they are to be let go. But if concord should be effected on these conditions, not peace, but the greatest commotion and many perils would follow."

By such and similar arguments Dr. Seiler opposes the course taken by the Lutherans, and insists that "such remedies will not heal the disease, but will make it worse."*

2. Lazarus Spengler, Secretary to the Nuremberg Senate, was one of the noblest spirits of the age, a thorough Protestant, and one of Luther's most devoted friends. On or about August 26th he wrote a letter to Augsburg that is full of warning and of expressions of dissatisfaction with the concessions made by the Protestant portion of the Committee of Fourteen. He does not propose to judge the Articles from the standpoint of the theologian; but he declares that he "cannot regard them as harmless, as safe for the conscience, and without injury to the glory of God." It is especially offensive to him to hear it said in the matter of the Private Masses, "We cannot help it." He answers thus: "There is a difference between not being able to help a thing, and approving it. If it be beyond my power to prevent a thing that I regard as wrong, and it come to pass, then before God and my conscience I am innocent. But if I approve a thing that is wrong, which, as one in authority I might hinder or prevent, or not allow, with what kind of conscience can I answer before God, before my subjects and before the whole world?" He was most indignant that in such grave matters neither Luther nor the allies of the Evangelical cause had been consulted. He says: "Everyone must confess that Dr. Martin Luther is the one through whom, as his instrument, God Almighty has preached and published his word in Germany, and that up to this time he has been the leader and standard-bearer in this valiant transaction. Now, in my opinion, it is wholly improper to allow him, the originator and leader in these matters, the most learned and experienced theologian in Germany,

*Förstemann, II., 286 *et seqq.*

to be ignored, and that these articles should not be submitted to him before they are delivered and approved. Are we to suppose that Luther is so puerile and cowardly, that, should anything injurious and offensive be decided on behind his back, he would sit still and say nothing, and affect that what we had resolved on pleased him?" * * * "I fear this: Because we regard the Princes at Augsburg as our champions in matters of faith, and have looked up to them and have entrusted so much to them, God may in this way show us what it is to trust more to men than to him. I do not suspect Philip Melanchthon of having done anything that is impious and unchristian; because I have hitherto regarded, and still regard, him as a wise, learned, pious and honorable man. Neither shall this transaction cause me to suspect him of having done anything so entirely reprehensible. For I consider that he is too pious knowingly to approve a thing that is against his conscience and contrary to the Gospel. But consider that Melanchthon has not had the experience of Luther. He has not yet been violently attacked as Luther has been. He is too unsophisticated for those cunning, unscrupulous court-knaves. He has also not yet learned the devil as is necessary in dealing with such people. It may be that in cases where the fundamentals are preserved, his love of temporal peace would lead him to yield and to consent, where Luther, or another, would do otherwise."*

3. The Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the legates of the Evangelical cities were violently hostile to the concessions that had been made by the Protestants, and especially were they displeased with the agreement to restore the full authority of the Bishops. We do not, indeed, have any written protest or remonstrance from the parties named above, but we have contemporaneous accounts that report their "great displeasure," and the earnest contentions they had with the Saxons, and their expressed unwillingness that anything more should be conceded.†

*Pressel's *Lazarus Spengler*, p. 72.

†See letter of Bernhard Besserer of Ulm in Kolde's *Analecta Lutherana* p. 148; C. R., II., 313; Schirmacher, p. 242-2; Coelestin, III., 58b.

Melanchthon himself tells us that one of the Nuremberg legates, Baumgartner, had written him, that had he (Melanchthon) been hired by the Roman Pope, he could not have undertaken a better method of reinstating the papal domination than that which had been proposed.* John Brentz reports that the populace actually charged that the Lutheran portion of the Committee had been corrupted by papal gold.†

The whole situation is thus described by Hieronimus Baumgartner, of Nuremberg, in a private letter to Lazarus Spengler: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I cannot refrain from informing you confidentially how I regard the transactions of the Diet, in so far as they have reference to the faith.

"First. You know from what has transpired how our party has been already solicited and urged, now by one devil and now by another, who clothe themselves in pleasing form, yea, at times appear and act as angels of light. The opposite party has not indeed accomplished its purpose, and the proposals made by ours have not been publicly accepted, yet we find that the present intention is to report these proposals in the Recess as approved. And although this has not yet occurred, yet they do nothing in vain, but are always wringing some concessions from us. These concessions they hold on to, and will use them when our distress is the greatest. But God by special grace has appointed that the Confession has been delivered; otherwise our theologians would make a very different confession, as they would gladly do, if we would follow them, though they do not agree with each other. Philip has become more childish than a child, Brentz is not only destitute of tact, but is coarse and rude. Heller is full of fear. These three have misled the pious Margrave, and made him pusillanimous. They persuade him to do what they wish, though I observe that he wants to do right. The pious Vogler must have it said of him in his absence: If he were yet here so much that is good and pacific could not have been accomplished. In these negotiations the Elector has no one more sagacious than Dr. Brück. But he has been so far influenced that now

*C. R., II., 336.

†C. R., II., 338.

even he acts with hesitation, (*mit Sorgen*), because he has no one to stand by him. For the other Saxon theologians dare not say a word publicly against Philip, or he is aroused, and replies, as lately he did to the Chancellor of Lüneburg: If anybody dares to say that the proposals made are not Christian, he lies like a villian. Whereupon he was answered: If anybody says the contrary, etc. Besides, those who act in a courageous and Christian manner are unceasingly slandered in every way, as we were witnesses to in the case of the Hessians, who in these matters have conducted themselves most uprightly and honorably.

"In a word. So soon as we reject some harsh and ungracious decision of the Emperor, they try so to entangle us as to have us give up the favor of God without getting that of the Emperor. It has continued to be the case that whenever the Princes are together, some one comes to the Elector and tells him what he honestly and sincerely thinks of matters, etc., and says that if some concession be made in this or in that part, etc., matters can yet be mended. Then comes Philip with his articles and explanations. Meanwhile these are reported to the Margrave by Heller and Brentz. If we refuse the broth they have concocted, their theologians run round and say that we will not allow peace (as though peace could be made by our concessions), and wish to act in concert with the Landgrave, whom they have outrageously slandered."*

There can be no doubt that this picture is painted in striking colors and is somewhat overdrawn; but that in its main features it is true to the life, is made sufficiently evident by numerous letters and reports written by other hands. Baumgartner, who was one of the Nuremberg legates, was too intelligent a man not to be able to comprehend the situation, and too honorable to wish to misrepresent it, though the intensity of his conviction may have led him into slight hyperbole. The situation was a distressing one. It cannot be denied that the feet of the Saxons and the Margravians had almost slipped back into the ways of Rome. Neither can it be denied that it is due preëminently to

*C. R., II., 363-4.

the Nurenberg, Lüneburg, and Hessian laymen that the reactionary movement set in, which, in its consummation, saved the day at Augsburg. For those laymen, as official and private documents demonstrate, not only resisted the making of further concessions, but criticised and condemned those that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen. Even Melanchthon himself has conceded as much. In a letter to Luther written September 4th, he says: "Our allies are manifestly playing the Elbe. Hence I am strengthened in the conviction that we ought to make peace. The Nurenberg legates and the Hessians do not keep within bounds, and the Lüneburgers agree with them. Ours think that no opportunity of making peace, provided it can be honorably made, ought to be lost." *

THE COMMITTEE OF SIX.

The Committee of Fourteen failed, as has been shown, to reach an ultimate basis of agreement. Only two or three matters, and those appertaining to ceremonies, and not to doctrines, separated its members. The Catholic Middle Party was encouraged rather than discouraged with the result. They thought that the difficulty lay in persons, and not in the subjects at issue. Duke George especially was regarded as the stumbling-block.† Hence it was resolved by the Catholics to eliminate him from the Committee. But in order to do this diplomatically, some of the Catholic Princes importuned the Elector of Saxony to agree to the appointment of a Committee of three on a side further to consider the points at issue. But such a proposition did not commend itself to some of the Protestants. They looked upon it as "vexatious and knavish," and discussed the matter in three separate meetings. Finally they agreed to it, but with the distinct understanding that nothing more was to be conceded to the Catholics.‡ On the side of the Catholics Bernhard Hagen Chancellor of the Elector of Cologne, Hieronimus

*C. R., II., 350. †Förstemann, II., 290; Schirrmacher, 242.

‡Cochlaeus, *Historia Martini Lutheri*, 406-7; C. R., II., 312; Schirrmacher, p. 242; Spalatin, *Annales*, 189; Sleidan's *History* (Eng. Trans.), p. 132.

Vehus Chancellor of Baden, and Dr. John Eck; and on the side of the Protestants, Dr. Gregory Brück Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony, Dr. Sebastian Heller Chancellor of Margrave George of Brandenburg, and Philip Melanchthon, were appointed.*

The Protestant Three were instructed to confine themselves to the discussion of five points: The Mass, Communion under both Kinds, the Marriage of the Priests, Monastic Vows, Episcopal Power; and to make no additional concessions, and to ascertain whether the opposite party would make additional concessions.†

August 24th the Joint Committee of Six met in the *Rathhaus*. Immediately the Catholics insisted on Communion in one kind on the Mass with the traditional ceremonies, and with both Canons, on priestly celibacy, on the support of the cloisters with the wonted service and dress, and on episcopal government of the churches. The Lutheran Three are clearly on the alert, and place themselves more in an attitude of defense than they had done in the Committee of Fourteen. The severe but merited condemnation of their former course, and the conditions that had attended their second appointment, had not only tied their hands, but had evidently quickened their Protestant consciousness. Hence they reply to the proposals of the Catholics in a somewhat decided tone: They cannot permit communion under one kind except in cases of necessity; they cannot tolerate Private Masses, since such masses are regarded as an *opus operatum*, and as a sacrifice for the living and for the dead; they reject the celibacy of the clergy, because it is a human invention, and marriage is an order of God; they will abide by what was agreed to in the Committee of Fourteen; they are willing to refer the matter of Episcopal government and church ceremonies to a free general council.‡

Two days later, Friday, August 26th, the Joint Committee

*Müller, *Historie*, p. 801; C. R., II., 312; Förstemann, II., 290-1; Coelestin, III., 60.

†*Strassburg Politis. Corresp.*, p. 487.

‡The Proposals of the Catholics, and the Reply of the Lutherans, are given by Müller, *Historie*, pp. 801 *et seqq.*, taken from Chancellor Brück's *Geschichte*.

met again. But nothing new was proposed by the Catholics. The Catholics refused to remove any of the manifest abuses, since they held that "their usages were right and must abide." The Lutherans refused to concur in what had been proposed, "but declared that should other Christian proposals be made, such as would bring no burden upon their consciences, another interview would not be declined."* In subsequent negotiations the Catholics reported that since agreement could not be effected, the Emperor was disposed to order a council, but under the condition that all innovations, both in doctrine and in church usages, should be discontinued among the Protestants, "and thus the common Church should be restored."†

The Lutherans reply that inasmuch as through the carelessness and neglect of the Bishops, false and seductive doctrines and usages have been introduced into the churches, as was shown in the Articles of the Confession, the Princes felt bound before God and their own consciences to make a Christian reformation as justified by the Scriptures and by the laws of the Pope himself. It was in accordance with precedent that in matters of faith a reformation should be introduced. They promise that they will lay the new proposals of the Catholics before their Principals.‡ This they did, and on Sunday, August 28th, an answer, both verbal and in writing, was rendered. The answer is a state-paper rather than a theological argument. It reviews the circumstances that attended the appointment and negotiations of the Committee of Fourteen. It then states that the Lutherans had done all in their power to make peace, and had conceded everything that could be conceded with a good conscience and with a proper regard for the honor of God; they had steadily appealed to a general council; that the Elector and other Orders, notwithstanding the opposition of some of their allies, have consented to the appointment of the Smaller Committee; that the Elector and Princes are not willing to proceed further, nor will they accede to the terms proposed by the

*Müller, p. 817; Förstemann, II., 301.

†Müller, 819.

‡Müller, p. 820.

Smaller Catholic Committee, since this is not more favorably inclined to peace than was the Larger Committee. But should more suitable terms be proposed for composing the difficulties, and for establishing peace, the Lutherans are ready to respond. The Catholics know the causes of the Abuses, and the sources of the doctrines contained in the Confession; the only cure for the Abuses in the Church is a free general council. The Catholic Orders should insist on the calling of such a council; that meanwhile the Protestant Orders will do all in their power by the help of God to promote peace, and will so administer their affairs as to give account to God and to the Emperor.*

This paper, which in all probability was written by Chancellor Brück, is firmer and more decided in tone than any other Protestant paper that had preceded it during these negotiations. There can be no doubt that the Protestant Three had been strengthened and stimulated by the opposition shown to the concessions of the Seven. They had remembered their instructions. They probably saw the danger of schism in their own ranks. The Saxons and the Margravians, who had taken the lead in these peace negotiations almost to the exclusion of their allies, could not afford further to risk the alienation of the Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the Evangelical cities. By some means, perhaps by the clear-righted criticisms of their allies, the Committee had come to see that the Catholics were ruled by the principle of ecclesiastical authority, by tradition, and by the theology of the Middle Ages.† They had also learned finally that the Catholics would not concede their appeal to a general council, except upon the condition that the Protestants, both in doctrine and in practice, should return to harmonious action with the Catholic Church, that is, would themselves again become Roman Catholics.

These discoveries, which become increasingly manifest in the

*Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 120 *et seqq*; Müller, pp. 821 *et seqq*; Chytraeus, 273 *et seqq*; Förstemann, II., 306 *et seqq*; Latin in Coelestin, III., 59 *et seqq*.

†See Eck's letter to Melanchthon, August 27th (C. R., II., 316-7; Schirrmacher, 243-4), in which he says that he would surrender his life in defense of the *opus operatum*.

later negotiations, would naturally lead the Protestants to place more emphasis on their fundamental principle that the word of God must determine and shape all articles of faith and all usages of the Church. Thus the antitheses of the two systems, of Catholicism on the one hand, and of Protestantism on the other, rose into greater prominence. At any rate the Protestants begin now to act more like Protestants. A reaction has manifestly set in, and the Answer of August 28th marks the beginning of the end of the peace negotiations. Henceforth the Saxon and Margravian* leaders take a firmer stand. Of this we have official evidence: On the morning of August 29th the Nuremberg legates are assured by Chancellor Brück that "in his opinion nothing additional would be conceded;" and when on the morning of the same day they lay the Nuremberg Remonstrance before the Elector of Saxony, they receive an apologetic answer about the concessions that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen, and are informed that additional concessions will not be made, at least not until others shall have been consulted. The same morning also Melanchthon and others are commissioned to write a reply to the Catholic Confutation of August 3rd.† Three days later, September 1st, Melanchthon wrote to Luther: "Day before yesterday (August 30th), our conference was closed. We refused to accept the conditions in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, Private Masses, and Celibacy."‡

It is sad to reflect that in these later, and in the earlier, negotiations, everything is made to turn finally on subjects which the

*The Margrave, however, is still greatly frightened, as we learn from his conversation with the Elector of Brandenburg, reported by the Nuremberg legates, August 29th. He believes that war is imminent, and that it would furnish a good opportunity for the Turks to carry out their plans, according to the proverb: *Duobus litigantibus tertius ridebit*. C. R. II., 319. But as proof that the Protestant estates as a whole had taken a firmer stand, see what the Nuremberg legates report on p. 320: "They did not think that it was obligatory upon them to betake themselves to methods and proposals beyond what had been already made."

†C. R., II., 351; Schirrmacher, 530; Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 87.

‡C. R., II., 336.

Confession had treated as "Abuses." The so-called doctrinal articles of the Confession seem to have dropped out of sight; at least they are not held up in this Small Committee as a ground of difference and as a sufficient reason for separation. One may be thankful that in this long contest of over two months so much that is fundamental to Protestantism was saved; but it would be a thousand times more satisfactory, had the Protestants, both in their Confession and in the subsequent negotiations, given a clearer, a sharper statement of the distinctive evangelical *doctrines*, and had made a more valiant defense of those doctrines, as Luther, Melancthon and others had enunciated and defended them in their private writings.*

But the Catholics were not satisfied with the Protestant Reply of August 28th. The next evening, August 29th, Duke Henry of Brunswick, the Bishop of Liege and Count Hoyer of Mansfeld, took supper with the Elector of Saxony. The Duke and others, in speeches, not all of which were gracious, insisted on the appointment of a new committee to take the matter under final advisement.† The Protestants considered the proposition the next day,‡ but promptly declined it. For some days already there had been a growing unwillingness to make additional concessions to the Catholics, or to engage with them in any further negotiations on the subject of reunion. "Besides on

*Protestant and Catholic historians agree in the representation that the Confession was not composed so as to present a clear and unambiguous statement of the *distinctive* Lutheran teaching. Attention has been called to the fact that in Article IV. it omits the *sola*, which had been the Lutheran watchword, and that in Article XX. it declares that the Lutherans "do not forbid good works." See Ranke, *History of the Reformation* (English translation), V., IX., p. 357; Pastor's *Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, pp. 22-27; Baumgartner's *Geschichte Karls V.*, p. 28, 29; Seeberg's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II., 330, notes 2 and 3, who calls attention to *une fatale Diplomatie* with which Melancthon defends Art. X. in the Apology; Loofs's *Dogmengeschichte*, second ed., p. 368, and note; Maurenbrecher's *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation*, p. 288; Harnack's *History of Doctrines*, Vol. VII., *passim*; Möller, *Hist. Christ. Ch.*, III., 107.

†Schirrmacher, 248; Coelestin, III., 61a.

‡C. R., II., 334.

that day came Luther's answer, and that gave the casting vote." *

The language in which this final decision of the Protestants

*Dr. H. Virck in *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, IX., 312. (1.) Already on the morning of the 29th, Luther's answer was expected (C. R., II., 322, 327). Written on the 26th it could easily have reached Augsburg by the evening of the 29th, or on the morning of the 30th, since "the messenger must return in haste." De Wette, IV., 147-8. (2.) The next day the Elector asked permission to return home. This he would scarcely have done had he not been convinced by Luther's answer of the futility of any further negotiations. (3.) The promptness and decisiveness manifested in rejecting the proposition of the Catholics shows the presence of a new influence. (4.) Seckendorf says distinctly: "It seemed good to the Protestants, confirmed by Luther's letters, to abstain from that deceitful negotiation for concord." Lib., II., § LXXV.; and Maurenbrecher says: "In my opinion Luther's letters of August 26th to the Elector John, Spalatin, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas and Brentz (De Wette, IV., 140-145) were undoubtedly the deciding factors" (*Geschichte*, p. 411). (5.) On the morning of the 29th Melanchthon informs Luther that his answer has not yet been received (C. R., II., 327). On September 1st, he informs him: "Day before yesterday (August 30th) our conference came to an end. For we were not willing to accept the terms in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, private masses and celibacy" (C. R., II., 336). See also Enders (*Briefwechsel Luther's*, Vol. 8 : 216, 239), who says: "This letter, as likewise the following of August 26th, came to Augsburg on the 30th." Bernhard Besserer in his letter to Ulm, August 24th, says that a letter has been received from Luther, which shows that he has become "perfectly furious" over the situation at Augsburg. Such a Luther letter as Besserer describes is not extant, but that such a letter had been received at Augsburg, cannot be doubted. As Besserer's letter, which only recently has been published, throws much light on the situation at Augsburg just after the dissolution of the Committee of Fourteen, we give it here in the original: "Aber die Evangelischen haben sich lang mit einander darumb zweyt, vnnnd den vsschus nit zugeben wollen, dann es haben die prediger der *schneff*, *Eyssleben*, auch der von *Lunenburg* zwen vnd der Marggrauen zween prediger ein grossen misfall darab gehapt, das sich der *Melantho* im aussus, so weit hinfur hat gethon, vnd gesagt er handle dem Ewangelio gar zuwider, vnd verstand die sacht nit, vnd mug auch also nit erlitten werden. doch vff das Jungst haben die Ewangelischen disen vorangezeigt vsschus auch zugelassen, doch den irn beuolhen, das sy nichts hinder inen bewilligen wollen. Der *Lutler* ist gannz wild, ab der sacht, er schreibt in her, was sy darmit mainen, das sy also in der sacht vmb gangen, haben sy ein gutt sacht, warumb sy sich nit darbey funden lassen, sey dann ir sacht kain nutz, warumb sy nit darvon standen, vnd ist ein weil die meinung gewesen, man weil dem *Luter* her bschreiben, vnd den Keyser vmb glait ansuchen, Aber *Me. lanchto* hat es gewandt, In Summa Es halt yederman darfur der *Melancho*

is recorded,* shows a marked change of sentiment. On the morning of the 29th the Elector of Saxony had "graciously heard" the Nuremberg Remonstrance, and, as we have learned, had promised that he would not make any more concessions. And now when Luther's letters came, the change was made complete. In the face of strenuous opposition from their most devoted allies, and in view of Luther's emphatic rejection of the Articles of Agreement, it would have been morally impossible for the Saxons and the Margravians to continue this solemn farce with the Catholics, in which they had not played the most manly and courageous part.

With this action of the Protestants on August 30th, the negotiations for reunion and concord came practically to a close. The crisis was past. The opposition that had set in when the concessions of the Protestant Seven became known, and Luther's letters, had forced the Saxons and the Margravians back beyond the point of danger, and had brought them to a better understanding with some of their allies.† Melancthon indeed still longs and sighs for peace and reconciliation, and some of the Catholics make fresh proposals, and desire to continue negotiations; but all in vain. The Protestants remain firm, and reply that they cannot concede more than had been already conceded. Luther continues to exhort his friends to steadfastness,‡ while the Elector of Saxony insists on taking his leave of the Diet. Finally, September 22nd, the Protestants offer to read their Apology of the Confession. The next day the Elector, accompanied by his illustrious Chancellor and by his theologians, left Augsburg. His example was followed the same evening by the Dukes of Lüneburg and the Prince of Anhalt, and on the next day by the legates of Reutlingen, Heilbron and Kempten.

Practically the Diet of Augsburg was now brought to a close.

werd den Curfursten verfuern, das die Ewangelischen all zu spott darab worden, der *Luther* wer besser zur handlung wann all die, so allhie sind etc." Kolde *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 148.

*Schirrmacher, p. 248; Coelestin, III., 61a; Sleidan, p. 132.

†C. R., II., 334.

‡De Wette, IV., 154-7.

Further negotiations and conferences could make no essential changes. The Augsburg Confession had passed into history; the *Vergleichsverhandlungen* had come to nought; the Catholics and Protestants were farther apart at the close of the Diet than they had been at its beginning. All subsequent efforts to reunite them have failed. Their fundamental principles are different. Protestantism is based on the word of God. Catholicism is based on the authority of the Church. Protestantism holds that the institutions of men have no dominion over the conscience. Catholicism holds that the institutions of the Church bind the conscience as conditions of salvation. Protestantism teaches that the Confession itself is open to revision and to improvement in statement.* Catholicism pronounces an anathema on all who reject her canons and decrees.†

MELANCHTHON AT AUGSBURG IN 1530.

It is scarcely possible to misunderstand the attitude of Melanchthon during the famous Diet at Augsburg in 1530. He labored with all diligence and sincerity to make reconciliation between the Lutherans and Catholics. This idea possessed him as a consuming passion. He believed, and his Elector believed, that the Emperor had called this Diet for the specific purpose of reëstablishing peace and ecclesiastical unity between the two parties. The realization of such a purpose was in harmony with Melanchthon's nature, and with his convictions of duty to the Emperor and to his country. He knew that his Elector also desired to re-establish harmonious relations with the Catholic Church,‡ of which he and his theologians claimed still to be members. Besides, Melanchthon was an imperialist. He revered the Emperor with a veneration that bordered an idolatry. He looked upon him as one of those fabled heroes and demigods that in olden times were believed to walk among men. He esteemed him endowed with all civil, domestic and Christian

*See Bishop von Scheele's *Symbolik*, pp. V. and 31 in Part First, and pp. 80, 81 in Part Second.

†See Council of Trent, *passim*.

‡Fikenscher, *Geschichte des Reichstags zur Augsburg*, p. 140.

virtues, and applied to him the lines in which Horace describes Augustus:

Hoc nihil majus meliusve terris
Fata donavere, bonique Divi:
Nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
Tempora priscum.*

As the converse of this imperialistic infatuation he literally hated the republican ideas of the Swiss. He believed that the Swiss were plotting to overthrow the Emperor,† and were seeking union with the Lutherans for the purpose of gaining assistance to carry out their revolutionary schemes.‡ Philip of Hesse, who favored the Zwinglians, he called *Antiochus*.§ In addition, the Swiss held *dogmata intolerabilia*.|| Under these circumstances, and with such predilections and prepossessions, he fancied that his party still stood very near to the Catholic Church, and very near to the Emperor. Hence, apart from union with the Church and agreement with the Emperor, he foresaw only wars, bloodshed, devastation, civil and religious commotions.¶ Such anticipation filled his soul with horror, and controlled every motion of his pen. It led him to compose the Confession "in the sense of the closest possible approximation to the old Church and of harshest separation from the Zwinglians;"** to write to Cardinal Campegius: "We have no dogma different from the Roman Church," and "we are ready to obey the Roman Church;"†† and "to make good to the Bishops their jurisdiction."‡‡

Melanchthon also knew the jealousies of the theologians,§§ and the inconstancy, *imbecillitas animi*, of the Protestant Princes.|||| Nearly three years after the Diet he wrote to his friend Hieron-

**Carminum Liber IV.*, II. See Melanchthon's letter to John Silberborn, C. R., II., 430 *et seqq.*

†C. R., II., 104, 340.

‡C. R., II., 83, 221; XXIII., 749; Möller, III., 99; *Epist. Judic.*, p. 40.

§C. R., II., 118. ||C. R., II., 25, 104.

¶C. R., II., 382, and *Melanch. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

**Baumgarten's *Geschichte Karls V.* ††C. R., II., 170.

‡‡C. R., II., 81. §§*Melanchth. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

||||C. R., II., 314.

imus Baumgartner, of Nuremberg: "I do not deny that at Augsburg I was much inclined to peace. But I knew ours. You would scarcely believe how far some were from that evangelical constancy and moderation of which they boast."* Twenty-six years after the Diet he wrote to Flacius, his worst enemy, that at Augsburg he had "many to blame him; no one to assist him."† Even the Roman Catholics charged him with obstinacy, and blamed him for the miscarriage of the peace negotiations, and besought him for the sake of Germany and of all the Princes to promote peace and the reunion of the divided Church.‡ Never was a man placed in a more trying position, nor burdened with graver responsibilities. The security of the Empire, the stability of the whole ecclesiastical structure in Germany, seemed to hang on him. Hence we hear him exclaim: "Not by my fault shall peace be destroyed."§ He deserves to be heard in his own defense. Writing to Matthew Alber, August 23rd, he says:

"What condition will posterity be in if the government of the Bishops be destroyed? The civil rulers care nothing about the government of the Church and similar matters of religion. Besides, too many in the churches stand in the way of peace. Hence we have thought it good in some way to join ourselves with the Bishops, lest we be harassed by the disgrace of schism. Therefore we will be easier in conscience after that for the sake of peace we shall have conceded all that can be conceded with a good conscience. Prudent and learned men ought to consider the evil that will result from the dissolution of the government of the Church. As it now is, the Bishops sit on their thrones. These I will not overthrow, but I will preserve them if I can."||

On the 31st of August he wrote to Camerarius: "Oh that, oh that, I were able, not to confirm the domination, but to restore the administration of the Bishops. For I see what kind

*C. R., II., 632.

†C. R., VIII., 843.

‡See Eck's letter to Melancthon, C. R. II., 316-7; also C. R. II., 382; Schmidt's *Ph. Melancthon*, p. 231.

§*Melancthon. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

||C. R., II., 303.

of Church we will have when once the ecclesiastical government shall have been dissolved. I see in the future a more intolerable tyranny than has ever yet been. Besides, we have hitherto conceded nothing to the enemy except those things that Luther thought ought to be conceded, when the matter had been thoroughly canvassed prior to the Diet. Nor will I for the sake of peace concede anything additional."*

After the failure of the peace negotiations Aegidius von Plackery, Chancellor to the Archbishop of Liege, and imperial chaplain, wrote Melancthon, reproaching him with pride and obstinacy, and beseeching him to use his influence to have the Protestants accept the demands of the Catholics. The reproaches and objurgations of the Chancellor were easily answered. The letter, which has been called "a sad counterpart" to the writer's letter of July 6th to Cardinal Campeggius, is as follows: "I can not reply at sufficient length to Your Most Reverend Paternity, for the reason that I am engaged in preparing an apology to be presented to the Emperor, which is to be somewhat sharper than the Confession, that is, if we cannot obtain justice. You inform me of certain opinions held about me by some of yours, and make the harsh accusation that your Princes are rendered more intractable by my pride and obstinacy. I will first reply briefly to the accusations.

"My manner of life is known to all good men, and can be judged from my recently published private writings. In these matters and controversies of religion, I wish so to act as not to offend God. Hence on God's account I think I ought to ignore those accusations.

"In regard to my obstinacy I reply as follows: If I have been the cause of this tempest, then let the Emperor cast me into the sea as a Jonah, or at once crucify and torture me on the rack. God is my witness that I have sought peace only because I saw that if peace be not established the result will be a union of ours with the Zwinglians. Such a consummation I have with all diligence and fidelity prevented. Should such a union be consummated, the greatest confusion of doctrines and re-

*C. R., II., 334.

ligious practices will in all probability follow. If our opponents would carefully consider this, they would not so persistently stir up war against us. Should war break out, not only would uncounted physical evils follow, such as the devastation of Germany, slaughter, debauchery, sacrilege, rapine, but spiritual evils, that are far worse, would follow, such as confusion and disorder in matters of religion.

"I have already shown in what manner I thought these dissensions can be allayed. I have often shown that peace can be established paucis scilicet et exiguis rebus dissimulatis. In the event of peace we could use our talents in overthrowing heresies. But if our adversaries will not cease to stir up the Emperor against us, though they should overcome us by arms and by violence, they cannot overcome the things that have been written. It is not true, as complained of, that the Princes want to hold on to the property of the Church. This they have affirmed again and again in the assembly of the Princes. Farewell." *

Thus Melancthon's letters are at once the best exposition and the best explanation of his course at Augsburg. Imperialistic politics, aversion to Zwinglianism, dread of caesaropapism, were the three controlling motives that shaped his course. Under the sway of these motives he conceded too much at Augsburg, but that he conceded more than the Elector and the Margrave wanted him to concede, or that they expressed dissatisfaction with his concessions, cannot be shown.† On the contrary, in the famous Reply of August 28th (see above) they declare that they agreed to the appointment of the Smaller Committee, on the condition that the conclusions reached in the Committee

*C. R., II., 381-3. Bretschneider placed this undated letter about the 19th or 20th of September. But Schirrmacher (p. 246) and Virck (*Zeilschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, IX., 317, have shown that it was written about the last of August or the first of September.

†So late as September 4th, Melancthon, describing the resistance still shown by the Nurenbergers, Hessians and Lüneburgers, to further peace negotiations, says: "Ours"—meaning especially the Saxons—"judge that the opportunity of making peace, provided it can be made honorably, ought not to be lost." C. R., II., 340.

of Fourteen;* and even when the Nuremberg legates presented the Remonstrance of their Senate, August 29th, the Elector of Saxony declared in the presence of two of his counsellors that in his judgment the proposals of the Committee of Fourteen "might be admitted without any burdening of the conscience," and that he "had delivered the same in order that it might not be said that this party was undiplomatic (*ungeschickt*), and would take no account of friendly proposals."†

What more could Melanchthon have said? It was not cowardice nor any selfish consideration, but chiefly the perils of the Princes, the dangers to the Empire, and the impending evils to the Church, the vacillating and uncertain purposes of some of the Protestants themselves, that determined much of his conduct, and forced him to a false position.‡ Even those sharp-sighted and uncompromising Nuremberg legates, Christopher Kress and Bernhardt Baumgartner, so late as August 26th praise the diligence, the anxiety, the toil and conscientious purpose of Melanchthon;§ while August 23rd, 29th, and September 4th, they manifest dissatisfaction with the syncretistic temper of the Elector and the Margrave, and with their frequent visits to the Emperor;|| and when zealous friends of the Protestant cause at Augsburg suggested to Luther suspicions concerning Melanchthon, the great chieftain at Coburg wrote the gentle and peace-loving Philip: "I would rather believe you than them, but I hope you will not keep anything hid from me."¶

As the situation in which he was placed—that of theological and diplomatic leader to his party—was a complicated one; as every official transaction in which he participated, involved the most far-reaching and momentous consequences to Church and to State, historians will never agree perfectly in judging his con-

*Coelestin, III., 60a; Chytraeus (Latin), p. 282; Müller, 823.

†C. R., II., 322. The Elector also said "he did not suppose that the opposite party would accept the proposals, if it depended on the chief points"—which looks like dangerous experimenting. *Ibid.*

‡C. R., II., 311.

§C. R., II., 314.

||C. R., II., 301, 322, 339.

¶De Wette, IV., 168.

duct. It was the fate of this man whom nature and talents had fitted preëminently for the study and the professor's chair, to be forced to take part in the practical solution of the great political and ecclesiastical questions of his age. What wonder that he did not fully measure up to every demand of time and circumstance! Who could have done better? Who could have passed through that terrible ordeal without making any mistakes? Who could have acted with a cleaner conscience? In view of his immortal services to the Reformation we may spread the mantle of charity over his mistakes at Augsburg in 1530.

LUTHER'S LAST LETTERS TO HIS FRIENDS AT AUGSBURG.

It will be recalled that from the beginning Luther did not expect any satisfactory results from the Diet. He, with his clear vision, deep intuition, and firm conviction, more than any other man then living, comprehended the difficulties and antagonisms of the situation. He knew what the Papacy taught. He knew what the word of God taught. He knew that the fundamental motive of Romanism was different from the fundamental motive of Protestantism. His earnest study of the divine word during the two months that preceded the opening of the Diet, had confirmed his convictions of the correctness of the Wittenberg teaching, and of the falsity of the Romish teaching. And, living at a distance, away from the scene of strife and contention, he was in the best possible situation to understand the significance of every movement, and to perceive the futility of prolonged controversy. His quick eye soon saw that not only had "too much been conceded in that Apology,"† but that the whole Protestant cause was likely to be betrayed by the spirit of concession that animated the Protestant leaders at Augsburg. At first he reasoned and argued; then as dangers thickened he threw his sword into the scale, and spoke in tones of authority. He rejected the Articles of Agreement, and pronounced them intolerable. He declared reunion undesirable and impossible. Luther and the Pope cannot be reconciled, unless the Pope re-

*See Schmidt's *Philipp Melanchthon*, pp. 233-4.

†De Wette, IV., 52.

nounce the papacy. Those were heroic words that Luther wrote in his letters of August 26th. They form a glorious part of the history of the Augsburg Confession. At no time did he speak in more commanding accents; nowhere has he offered a clearer exposition of the Protestant fundamental principle. But the representation would not be complete without Luther's later letters. August 28th he wrote to Spalatin: "Grant that you have manifestly made concessions (and that you will not do *Christo favente*) contrary to the gospel, and have shut up that eagle in a bag. Luther will come, do not doubt it, he will come, and will gloriously liberate that eagle. Christ thus lives. He is the truth. Therefore fear not those who triumph by violence and by deceit. Luther is free; also perchance Philip of Hesse is free. * * * Be brave and quit ye like men." * At length growing weary and disgusted with the futile and puerile negotiations for harmony, and longing to see the faces of his dear friends, he wrote Melanchthon, August 11th: "I am beginning to pine away with desire for your return. Oh that you would return, though cursed by the Pope and the Emperor. There is one greater than the Pope and the Emperor and their god, who says: *Salvation is of the Lord, and thy blessing is upon thy people*. The Lord will punish the deceit and wickedness of the Sophists and the Papists."†

On the fourteenth of September, Duke John Frederick and Count Albert came unexpectedly to Coburg. The next day Luther wrote to Melanchthon: "I was glad to see that they had escaped from that mob. Oh that I could in a short time see that you had escaped, since we cannot expect that you will be dismissed. You have done enough and more than enough. Now the Lord will have time for acting, and he will act. Only play the man and hope in him. * * * You (plural) have confessed Christ, you have offered peace, you have obeyed the Emperor, you have borne insults, you have been drenched with abuse, you have not returned evil for evil. In a word you have done the blessed work of the Lord as becometh saints. Rejoice in the Lord and exult, ye righteous. Look up and lift up your

*De Wette, IV., 155.

†De Wette, IV., 162.

heads, your redemption draweth nigh. I will canonize you as faithful members of Christ, and what higher honor do ye seek? Is it a small thing that ye have rendered Christ a faithful service; that ye have shown yourselves his worthy members? Far be it from you to esteem the favor of Christ a small thing."*

Finally, September 20th he wrote to Justus Jonas: "Grace and peace. From your last letter, My Jonas, I have learned that you have not yielded to the demands of the enemy, and I learn gladly that I may expect your return any day, whether cursed or blessed. But thunder and lightning are coming to me from a number of ours to the effect that you have betrayed everything, and for the sake of peace will concede more. I shall answer that ours have written that the terms proposed by the enemy have been rejected, and that the matter has been returned to the Emperor. Here I stand, so I believe. And when they so constantly and persistently urge and clamor that Luther has been influenced by you, that he has turned everything over to you, that greater danger threatens from you than from the enemy, that there is greater need of harmony among yourselves, than of treating with the enemy, they force me to exclaim: If things be so, then the devil has made a beautiful schism among us. For the stipulations, which you so appropriately name *unvergreifliche unbeschleissliche Mittel* (impractical and undecided proposals) I will not tolerate, though an angel from heaven should urge and command it. The enemy will not concede to us a hair-breadth, but we are to concede not only the Canon, the masses, one species, celibacy, the customary jurisdiction, but we are to confess that they have judged correctly and have been falsely accused by us. That is, they want to justify themselves and to condemn us, which means not simply that we recant, but that we curse ourselves over and over again, and bless them. But why do I detain you longer with such things as if you could not see their most base baseness and their monstrous impudence, which is such as can never be forgotten. And what need is there of offering so many stipulations, as if we wanted this? Suppose we grant only the Canon, or the Private Masses.

*De Wette, IV., 164-5.

Either would suffice to overthrow our entire teaching and to establish theirs. Let the old-time jurisdiction be given to the Bishops. Then everything has been still more completely surrendered. Will they, while remaining hostile to the Gospel, tolerate the preaching of the gospel? But I am forced by the harsh and unjust letters of ours to write these things only that they might be the proof that I have written you. For you know that I have heretofore signified how far I thought that jurisdiction might be conceded to the Bishops, and I have warned that you do not concede more. I have also written separately and more fully to the Prince. But I am preaching to deaf ears. Hence, My Jonas, see that I am informed about everything that occurs that I do not like; for I do not think the things contained in your letters are detrimental, inasmuch as the whole matter is to be referred to the Emperor. And be careful not to do anything by which a schism may spring up among ourselves. Let us have peace among ourselves, whatever may happen, though the author of peace, and the arbiter of wars, is greater than peace, and is to be honored more than peace. It is not our business to prognosticate future wars, but simply to believe and to confess. I do not write these things because I think you will make concessions, but because of the more than tragic violence of the letters with which ours scourge me. Moreover I will not concede a hair-breadth to the enemy, seeing that these most insolent and wicked men, inflated and confident because of our weakness, mock us and try to make fools of us. Moreover, I know Eck's character, made what it is not by art, but by nature, so that he is wont to draw off those who dispute with him from the state of the case and from the subject until he lures them into a net apart from the subject. But enough.

"A am almost bursting with anger and indignation. I beseech you, break off negotiations, cease to treat with them, and come back. They have the Confession. They have the gospel. If they want these, let them admit them. If they do not want these, then let them go to their own place. If war comes, let it come. We have prayed and done enough. The Lord has prepared them for the sacrifice, so as to render to them accord-

ing to their works. He will deliver us his people from the burning of Babylon. Pardon me, My Jonas, that I have poured this distress of my mind into your bosom. But what I write to you I write to all. The Lord Jesus bring you back safe and brave, and then make you to rejoice also, Amen. From the Hermitage. September 20th, 1530.

"Yours, MARTIN LUTHER."*

This letter, the last that Luther sent to his friends at Augsburg, is important for the view it gives of the complicated situation, and for the determination it shows on the part of Luther to stand by the gospel, and to defend his friends from unjust accusations, now that they have rejected the final proposals of the Catholics, and have concluded to leave Augsburg. They had done enough, and more than enough. They had composed and delivered the Augsburg Confession. That was enough. They had made many concessions for the sake of peace. That was more than enough. The greatest event of the sixteenth century was behind them, and that event has made their names immortal. *Quidquid ex illis amavimus, quicquid mirati sumus, manet mansurumque est in animis hominum, in aeternitate temporum, fama rerum.*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

In preparing the articles entitled *Melanchthon and the Augsburg Confession* (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July, 1897, July and October, 1898), and *Luther and the Augsburg Confession*, (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1899, January, July and October, 1900), the following works have been used:

1. *Historia Martini Lutheri.* By Dr. John Cochleus. Hueber's German translation.
2. Jo. Sleidani *De Statu Religionis et Reipublicae Carolo Quinto Cæsare Commentarii*, 1557. English Translation by Edmund Bohun, Esq. London, 1689.
3. M. Johann Mathesius *Leben Dr. Martin Luthers.* 1565.
4. *Acta und Handlungen des Colloquii (Altenburg).* Wittenberg, 1570.

*De Wette, IV., 169 *et seqq.*

5. Endlicher Bericht und Erklärung der Theologen beider Universitäten, Leipzig und Wittenberg. * * * Wittenberg, 1570.

6. *Historia de Augustana Confessione breviter recitata in Academia Regiomontana a Johanne Wigando.* Regiomonti, 1574. Reprinted in Cyprian's *Historia*.

7. *Historia der Augspurgischen Confession* * * * durch D. Davidem Chytraeum. Rostock, 1576. Later revised and improved editions. Latin in 1578 with Preface by Matthew Ritter. Francoforti ad Moenem. "This edition appeared without the consent of Chytraeus." Rotermund, p. 194. See Preface. Chiefly documentary.

8. *Historia Comitiorum Anno M.D.XXX.* Augustae Celebratorum. * * * per Georgium Coelestinum S. Theol. Doct. Francofordiae cis Viadrum, 1577. 4 vols. fol. Invaluable for its large collection of original documents. Translations from the German should be compared with the originals.

9. *Recitationes Aliquot* * * * a Nicolao Selneccero D. Lipsiae, 1583.

10. *Gründliche Warhaftige Historia von der Augspurgischen Confession.* Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz, 1584.

11. *Harmonia Confessionis Augustanae,* * * * Studio et opera Andreae Fabricii Leodii. Coloniae, 1586. Roman Catholic, but very serviceable.

12. *Oratio Historica de Initiis, causis, et progressu Confessionis Augustanae* a Nicolao Selneccero. Hildesiae, 1590.

13. *Philippi Melancthonis Concilia* * * * collected by Christopher Pezel. Neustadii, 1600.

14. *Exegesis Augustanae Confessionis* * * * Auctore Balthasaro Menzero. Frankfurt a. M., 1685.

15. Jo. Benedicti Carpzovii *Isagoge in Libros Eccles. Luth. Symbolicos.* Editio tertia correctior. Lipsiae, 1690.

16. *Viti Ludovici a Seckendorffii Commentarius Historicus Apologeticus de Lutheranism.* Francofurti et Lipsiae, 1692. Controversial, but reliable. Drawn from original sources. Contains much documentary matter.

17. *Historie von der Evangelischen Stände Protestation und Appellation* * * * Von Johann Joachim Müller. Jena, 1705. Chiefly drawn from the Saxon Archives. Contains many original documents. Standard.

18. *Georgii Spalatini Annales Reformationis*. Published by Cyprian in 1718.

19. *Godofridi Hoffmanni Commentarius in Augustanam Confessionem*. Tübingae, 1727.

20. *Historia der Augsbürgischen Confession* * * * aus denen original-acten von Ernst Salomon Cyprian. XLI. Beylagen. Gotha, 1730. Many original documents.

21. *Christian August Saligs Volständige Historie der Augspurgischen Confession und derselben Apologie*. Halle, 1730. 3 vols. This work, consisting of 3172 quarto pages, contains a vast amount of valuable matter.

22. *Jo. Georgii Walchii Introductio in Libros Ecclesiae Lutheranae Symbolicos*. Jena, 1732.

23. *Henrici Alting Exegesis Augustanae Confessionis*. Amstelodami, 1752.

24. *Jac. Guilielmi Feuerlini Bibliotheca Symbolica Lutherana* * * * Edidit Joh. Bar. Riederer. Norimbergae, 1768.

25. *Strobel's Miscellaneen*. 3 vols. Nurenberg, 1780.

26. *Die Augsbürgische Confession* * * * Von M. Georg Panzer. Nurenberg, 1782.

27. *Kritische Geschichte der Augspurgischen Confession aus Archivalisten Nachrichten*. Von Georg Gottlieb Weber. Frankfurt a. M. 1783-4. 2 vols. The most thorough and complete critical history of the Augsburg Confession ever written.

28. *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken*. De Wette and Seidemann. Berlin, 1825-56. Chiefly Vol. IV. Enders's *Luthers Briefwechsel*, destined to supersede the De Wette edition, was received too late for use in the text.

29. *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Evangelicae sive Concordia*. Recensuit Carolus Augustus Hase. Lipsiae, 1827.

30. *Luther's Works*. Erlangen Edition, 1829-86. The Walch edition was published at Halle, 1740-50.

31. Geschichte des auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530 übergebenen Glaubensbekenntnisses der Protestanten * * * Von Heinrich Rotermund. Hannover, 1829.

32. Die Augsburgische Confession * * * Von Dr. J. L. Danz. Jena, 1829.

33. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Von Karl Pfaff. Stuttgart, 1830. 2 parts.

34. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. * * * Von Dr. Carl Fikenscher. Nurenberg, 1830. Made use of the Nurenberg "Protocol."

35. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Von M. Facius. Leipzig, 1830.

36. Förstemann's Archiv für Geschichte der Kirchlichen Reformation. Halle, 1831. This is Chancellor Brück's Geschichte der Religionshandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im J. 1530. Very valuable. Much quoted by J. J. Müller, as *Auctor Apologiae Manuscriptae*. Used by Cyprian. In the "Neander Library" of the Rochester Theological Seminary, and in the Peabody Library, Baltimore.

37. Förstemann's Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Halle, 1833, 1835. 2 vols. Original documents only.

38. Corpus Reformatorum (C. R). Halle and Braunschweig, 1834-56. Volume II. contains Melancthon's letters of the year 1530, and much other original matter, including the "Protocol" or official reports of the Nurenberg legates. Indispensable.

39. Symbolik der Lutherischen Kirche. Von Dr. Eduard Köllner. Hamburg, 1837.

40. Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die Augsburgische Confession * * * Von Dr. A. G. Rudelbach. Dresden, 1841.

41. Philipp Melancthon, Sein Leben und Wirken. Von Karl Matthes. Altenburg, 1841.

42. A History of the Reformation in Germany. By Leopold Ranke. Translated by Sarah Austin. Philadelphia, 1844.

43. *Confessio Augustana et Apologia Confessionis.* Edidit Fredericus Francke. Lipsiae, 1846.
44. *Die Symbolischen Bücher* * * * Von J. T. Müller, 1847. Seventh edition. Gütersloh, 1890.
45. *Comparative Symbolik.* Von Karl Matthes. Leipzig, 1854.
46. *Philipp Melanchthon.* Von Dr. Carl Schmidt. Elberfeld, 1861. Written from the sources.
47. *Luther and die Augsburgische Confession.* * * * Von H. J. R. Calinich. Leipzig, 1861. Prize Essay.
48. *Luther's Antheil an der Augsburgischen Confession.* Von J. K. F. Knaake. Berlin, 1863.
49. *Niedner's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1865. Pp. 515-629. Article by Englehardt. Also *Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. IX., 1888. Article by Virck.
50. *Einleitung in die Augustana.* Von Gustav Plitt. Erlangen, 1867-8. 2 Parts.
51. *The Augsburg Confession.* * * * By Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia, 1868.
52. *History of the Augsburg Confussion.* By J. H. W. Stuckenberg. Philadelphia, 1869. New Edition in 1897.
53. *Die Augsburgische Confession.* * * * Von O. Zöckler. Frankfurt a. M. 1870.
54. *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology.* By Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia, 1871.
55. *Apologie der Augustana.* Von Gustav Plitt. Erlangen, 1873.
56. *Martin Luther. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften.* Von Dr. Julius Köstlin. Elberfeld, 1875. Later editions. 2 vols.
57. *Creeks of Christendom.* * * * By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. New York, 1876. 3 vols. Later editions.
58. *Gieseler's Church History.* English Translation. New York, 1876-80. 5 vols. Vol. IV. for the History of the Reformation.
59. *Briefe und Acten zu der Geschichte* * * * des Reichstags zu Augsburg 1530. Aurifaber's Manuscript. Pub-

lished by Schirrmacher in 1876. Gotha. Chiefly original documents. Very valuable.

60. Dr. Joh. Aug. Ernesti Praelectiones in Libros Symbolicos Eccles. Luth. Berlin, 1878.

61. A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia, 1878.

62. Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen * * * Von Dr. Ludwig Pastor. Freiburg in B. 1879. Drawn from the sources. Roman Catholic.

63. Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation. Von Wilhelm Maurenbrecher. Nördlingen, 1889.

64. Mittheilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg. Viertes Heft. Nürnberg, 1882. Original letters.

65. The book of Concord; or the Symbolical Books of the Evang. Luth. Church. * * * By Henry E. Jacobs, D. D. Philadelphia, 1882, 1883. 2 vols.

66. Analecta Lutherana * * * Von Dr. Theodor Kolde. Gotha, 1883. Original documents.

67. Der Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas. Von Dr. Gustav Kawerau. Halle, 1884. 2 vols.

68. Martin Luther. Eine Biographie. Von Theodor Kolde, 1884, 1893. 2 vols.

69. Dr. Johann Eck. Von Theodor Wiedemann. Regensburg, 1885.

70. Geschichte Karls V. Von Hermann Baumgarten. Stuttgart, 1885-92. 5 vols.

71. Salnar's Harmonia Confessionum Fidei * * * Published by Dr. Ebrard. Barmen, 1887.

72. Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Von Theodor Brieger, *et al.* Leipzig, 1888.

73. Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte. Von Friedrich Loofs. Halle, 1890.

74. Die Konfutation der Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses, Ihre Gestalt * * * Von Johannes Ficker. Leipzig, 1891.

75. Lehrbuch der Symbolik. Von Gustav Friedrich Oehler. Second Edition by Theodor Hermann. Stuttgart, 1892.

76. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Von Dr. Reinhold Seeberg. Erlangen und Leipzig, 1895, 1898.

77. Symbolik. Von Professor E. F. Karl Müller. Erlangen und Leipzig, 1896.
78. Die Augsburgische Confession lateinisch und deutsch *
* * Von Dr. Th. Kolde. Gotha, 1896.
79. Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, Gotha, 1896.
80. Symbolik oder Confessionelle Principienlehre. Von Dr. K. F. Nösgen. Gütersloh, 1897.
81. Wilhelm Möller's The History of the Christian Church. Vol. III. 1900.
82. Real-Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Third edition.

ARTICLE III.

A CHAPTER IN MODERN CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

BY REV. C. F. SANDERS, A. M.

The subject chosen for this paper is very general. It allows choice of material from the entire range of Christian Evidence. It is, however, also specific. That it should be a chapter would confine it to a specific proposition. The specific proposition we have in view is the tangible fruits borne of Christianity in our own times in proof of its divine origin, its divine motive, and its divine destiny. I still further limit myself to the fruits of historical manifestation and those witnessed to in experience. This still leaves us in a large field. I shall not presume to give a full or even thorough presentation. Even if I were competent to this, the limits of the paper would preclude the possibility. I shall only indulge the humble hope of suggesting the force of these evidences from my point of view; not that my faith in Christianity rests alone upon these, but that these are evidences which touch the period of history with which my own life has to do testifying to the presence of an energy in the affairs of men manifestly divine.

While every age is acted upon by the preceding ages to a greater or less extent, and will act upon succeeding ages in

some proportion to its practical energy, nevertheless, the problems of each generation are in a large sense peculiar to it. England had its period of Deism; Germany its period of Rationalism, and I suppose the future historian will write of our times, The Age of Scientific Scepticism.

The Christian preacher must remain an apologist for Christianity so long as he remains with his religion in the sphere where the enemies of Christ can make assault, for so long is the herald of the cross a soldier enlisted in an incessant warfare. For the glory and the success of the cause there isn't any Dogmatic or Apologetic knowledge which will come amiss. The largest amount of information and the highest intellectual grasp will always find room here for severe exercise.

In our own times the presumption of science has resulted in an undue amount of Scepticism. The progress of victory will be measured by the strength of conviction on the part of the teachers and the consequent confidence of the taught in the things pertaining to the Christian religion. Against Scepticism there is no weapon so effective as unfaltering faith. There is no disrespect to the faithful implied when some one says that the prevalence of honest doubt begets a feeling of suspicion in the heart of the most zealous believer. Paul warning Timothy not to "be carried to and fro by every wind of doctrine" indicates to me that even to the heroic Apostle to the Gentiles disastrous results from false doctrines were not inconceivable in the well-instructed and well-grounded Timothy; and the warning seems to imply that Paul himself had been troubled. It becomes us to keep our convictions clear and to establish the confidence of the very weakest. Our duty takes us even farther; we should seek to convince the gainsayer and doubter.

It concerns us first to say a word as to the credibility of evidence. Science boasts of being exact, and Scepticism denies exactness to the evidences offered in defense of Christianity. Let us see how well the sciences fulfil their claim. An illustration each from a few must suffice. Geology accepts the glacial theory of Agassiz in explanation of the striation on rocks and the varieties of vegetation that belong to other latitudes finding

their way far from their habitat as well as for the formation of hills and valleys. The theory stretches back into the remote past millions of years and rests upon the strength of the inferences. It is accepted as scientific because it explains geologic phenomena best. That it does not solve some of the problems in geology does not confuse us. If anyone should object to the theory because of some things it does not explain, the burden of proof lies with him to show the absolute incompatibility of the theory from these problems. Astronomy is called an exact science, and yet Professor Newcomb has recently used the following language: "Of the distance of the sun we may say, with a reasonable approach to certainty, that it is 92,000,000 miles and some fraction of another million; and if we should guess that fraction to be 400,000 we should probably be within 200,000 miles of the truth." It is said that the lowest musical tone consists of pulsations of air at the rate of thirty per second; while it is estimated that the undulations of the cosmic ether producing green light are at the rate of 600 quadrillion (written with twelve ciphers after the 600) per second. It is evident, therefore that we have a measure of apprehension of things which we cannot comprehend. It is very evident that what we know is as nothing to what we know not. But the very fact that there is still so very much beyond what we know renders the little we have more secure. From these illustrations, and they could be very largely multiplied from every field of science, I conclude that science regards probable evidence sufficiently conclusive to require the critic to disprove it before he may have right to ask for more evidence. As Butler says: "In questions of difficulty, * * * if the result of examination be that there appears upon the whole any, the lowest, presumption on one side, and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability. * * * To expect a distinct comprehensive view of the whole subject, clear of difficulties and ob-

jections is to forget our nature and condition, neither of which admit of such knowledge with respect to any science whatever." We note further also that in the practical affairs of life, and therefore in matters of religion, we are guided more by the knowledge gained by inference than by any other kind of knowledge, for inference is the only possibility by which our deductions and experiences can at all be projected into the future in order to become of practical service to us.

It is my purpose now to show from reference to history of our own times and the experiences of men in our own times that there is an energy manifest in the affairs of men which testifies that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. While we cannot write under our conclusions "*quod erat demonstratum*" as we would do to the proof of a geometrical theorem, the evidence is such that the deductions establish the inference that the Christian postulate is true and that the only rational attitude towards it is to believe in it as implicitly as the mariner believes in his compass. In both cases, but in different senses, the belief definitely determines the direction of travel. The belief is only valuable for action.

The frontier line of Christian conquest has been most wonderfully expanded during the century now closing. During the life time of our oldest acquaintances the kingdom of God has accomplished a most remarkable work of aggression. The transformations wrought in every quarter of the globe surpass anything witnessed since the days of the Apostles. Seventy-five years ago the islands of the South Sea were the terror of the civilized world. The name Fiji sent a thrill of horror through everyone acquainted with the bloody atrocities of cannibalism. With language that vividly plays on the imagination, Pierson tries to show us a picture of the condition of that awful specimen of humanity. He says in the second series of his *Miracles of Missions*: "If one could dip his pen in the molten brimstone of hell's fiery lake, he could still write no just account of the condition of the Fijians fifty years ago. Two awful forms of crime stood like gates of hell to let in demons and shut out Gospel heralds: First, infanticide, and second cannibalism. Of all

children born, at least two-thirds were killed at birth; and to make sure of their death, there was a system of organized destruction, and every village had its authorised executioner to repeat the tragedy of Bethlehem's babes. Of course infanticide and parricide go together; and so, if the parents did not spare their offspring, neither did the offspring spare the parents, but despatched them when old or feeble." I can't conceive of any condition of humanity more loathsome and degraded than what the Fijians are known to have been. It stands at the farthest remove from the conditions in lands where the gospel has had its influence impressed. And there is force in Lowell's challenge to Infidelity and Atheism that if Christianity is distasteful to them, the fact that they do not choose for their place of habitation these places of farthest remove from Christian influence very largely destroys confidence in their sincerity.

Into that hideous condition of humanity the Missionary of the Cross entered in the second quarter of our century in the hope of its redemption. Who else could have dared to go? Who else could have dared to hope for the redemption of such a people? We say this with the tone of triumphant challenge; but we change our tone when we ask again, who else would have cared to go? This comment upon the natural human heart affects the boast of human superiority over animal creation damagingly. The natural history of morals fails to tell of any undertaking for the improvement of human conditions that will at all compare with this attempt. Love of country will inspire patriotism and be a sufficient explanation for deeds of valor and personal sacrifice; love of adventure may explain much of the daring manifested by men who pushed through forest and jungle to discover new lands; love of wealth will explain why some have dared the tropical jungle, and the Arctic winter in the frozen Klondike; but it is the love of humanity for Christ's sake that is the only sufficient explanation why a rational being should undertake the redemption of the Fijis as the missionaries of the gospel have done. Theirs was not a conquest for gold or spices. They did not go at the head nor in the wake of military demonstration. No earthly king anxiously watched the tide of battle.

Their march forward was not dependent on any promise of military intervention in case of harm.

I contend that the spectacle of a solitary missionary and his wife, without sword of steel, without musket, without prestige—for among cannibals the only prestige knowable is the prestige of a warrior or glutton—but with the cross as his standard, the Bible as his guide and consolation, his faith in God his only defence; the spectacle I say of such an undertaking, that a handful of humanity should disembark upon such an island under such circumstances and maintain themselves there receives a sufficient explanation only on the Christian view of the divine power present in Christianity.

But the Missionaries to the South Sea Islands did not only accomplish this spectacle before the world. They have also realized their hope. The islands are already Christian in part and all are rapidly becoming so. Where cannibalism was dominant a century ago we find the same race of people sitting "clothed and in their right mind." Says one: "The murderous baptism of blood has given place to the gracious baptism of cleansing." Says another: "The grand-children of these former savages have contributed thirteen thousand rupees to the famine sufferers in India. Can cannibals be rescued by the power of the gospel? Yes, and they can be made to sympathise to the extent of generous liberality towards a strange and distant people who are famishing for bread."

I have taken the Fijis for my first reference, for I regard the triumph of the Gospel there the most remarkable on record anywhere. There cannot be any doubt as to the fact of the transformation wrought. It cannot be said that the transformation proceeded from either native philosophy or native religion, for native philosophy there was none and the native religion is the curse that has been removed. It must be conceded that the manifest transformation has been wrought solely by the power of the gospel of Christ, for it is the only power that was at work in the period of transition. I will come back to this conclusion a little farther on.

Fortunately for humanity not all of the race outside of Christian influence has been left to suffer the extreme depths of possible human cruelty. Even to our own day there remains a large proportion of the civilized race under the spell of idolatry. True, they have religion. Some of them have attained a high state of civilization. Some of them have authentic history reaching back to times antedating the Patriarchs, with tradition and legend reaching into the mists of the very early antiquity of the race. I am not in the least confused by the fact that in all these centuries the revelation of God as expressed in his Son Jesus Christ has not come to them. It is not scientific to demand an answer why God should have passed them by for so long a time. If it is scientific for the geologist to rest the theories of the processes through which order was called out of chaos and the earth became fit for the habitation of man in time measurements covering many millions of years, it would certainly be unscientific to demand that in spiritual processes the results must be within a definite or fixed period of time. I claim that the Christian conception of the kingdom of God evangelizing the world by the energy of the divine power inherent in the name of Jesus Christ is in no way confined to a nameable number of years. We allow the evolutionist to speak of indefinite periods of time in the vaguest possible terms, but we agree that his theory is scientific, if only it harmonizes. We believe his theory as far as he has harmonized, it and the length of time does not trouble us. His inferences are projected into the past a thousand or possibly a hundred thousand times as many years as the time the Christian claims God has been seeking to reveal himself to the world through the revelation made by his Son. It must be scientific, therefore, to anchor our faith in the authenticity of the Christian hypothesis of a divine revelation if only we can harmonize the possibility of the world's redemption by the power manifest in the Christian religion even though it should take countless ages.

It is not necessary that we should say anything of the failure of the religion of the Chinese, of India or Persia. The course of our inquiry is to find out whether among the people where

ethnic religion has failed, Christianity can accomplish its purpose. Or rather whether the gospel has borne fruit among civilized heathen which would evidence its divine testimony. The very fact that the believer in the divinity of Christ should make the attempt of telling the gospel story to the followers of Brahm, Budha or Confucius, is an assumption on the part of the Christian Church that our religion contains a vital principle which these ethnic religions do not have, and which they need, and which Christianity can supply. Through a century of the most marvellous missionary enterprise the conviction has become settled that man's nature craves that which Christianity alone can supply. In Persia to day we find the habits and customs that compare with the age of the Patriarchs. In China we find only relics of a former greatness without inherent power to awaken out of the deep sleep into which the hermit nation fell a thousand years ago. In India the Hindu philosophy has evaporated the idea of spirit into the thin air of the most vague speculation.¹ These standing monuments of what man left without the special revelation made through Jesus Christ, may become, form the dark background which brings out the more splendid glory of Christianity in the picture of the civilization of the modern world. "Say what we please by way of criticism, it does not take long to perceive that the civilization of Europe and America is infinitely superior to that of the orient. It is equally clear that the civilization of our times has not been the cause but the product of our religion." We find also that Christianity which has brought us the blessings which contrast us so favorably with the orient, is producing the same blessed results on the territory of the effete ethnic religions. We are, therefore, in the presence of an accumulation of evidence drawn right from the records of our own times which demand an explanation.

In the mass of evidence the chief elements are the following: The most soul-satisfying civilization the world has ever known is that produced by the Christian religion; those most closely identified with the idea and propagation of this religion have caught the inspiration of its doctrine which declares it to be for

the universal redemption of the race; this inspiration has been sufficiently strong to concentrate the best energy of the entire Church to the accomplishment of its project; in the undertaking is shown the incomparable altruism of its central teaching by the fact of its persistent effort to realize its promise by the willing gift of liberal contributions and the consecration and sacrifice of its truest followers; the undertaking is proved well founded in the tidings of victory from every corner of the wide world; the heathen inheritance and the possession of the uttermost parts of the earth is being realized. Put this array of facts into the test tube of historical criticism, heat it to a white heat over the lamp of exact Logic, turn on it the X-Ray of the highest critical principles deducible from the philosophy of history, that even in matters of mind and spirit every effect must have an adequate cause, and bring to the result an honest heart, and bid it write with precision its conclusion. It cannot be other than that the name of Jesus is the power which is evangelizing the world. The one name which explains the inspiration, the motive, the aspiration and the result of Foreign Missions is the name of Jesus. Thus far there is scientific demonstration. Even John Stuart Mill acknowledged that "religion can not be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on Jesus as the ideal representative and guide of humanity;" and Lecky, by no means favorably disposed towards Christianity, admits that the "simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists." This demonstration carries with it the acceptance of the authenticity of the revelation by Jesus Christ as exhibited in the New Testament by that part of the human race which has enjoyed the highest blessings of our times and done most to bless humanity generally. We go beyond positive demonstration into the sphere of highest probability when we claim that this evidence justifies the inference that Jesus is divine. The only alternative for the inspiration, motive and results of Foreign Missions is founded on delusion. This involves the absurdity that rational creatures undertake their grandest enterprises and enjoy their

richest blessings by virtue of delusion which is a self-destructive theory, for that the rational should be inspired and in turn blessed by the irrational is manifest incongruity.

Frederick Wright has said carefully: "The demand for unattainable certainty leads in military matters to inactivity; in business affairs, to stagnation; in science, to empiricism; in philosophy to agnosticism; and in religion to scepticism." We come, therefore, to the proposition used at the beginning of this paper, Belief is of value only for action. If man has no care as to which direction he travels, or whether he travels at all, or to what harbor he is tending, he has no need to believe the directions of his compass. If man has no interest in the harmony of the spheres he has no need to believe the law of gravitation. If man places no value on character he has no need to believe in the power of habit. If man is not concerned about the longings of his spiritual nature he has no need to believe in any manner of religion. But the facts of history prove conclusively that man does have interest in these things, and he must have belief for action in every one. We conclude, therefore, that the belief for action in matters pertaining to his spiritual nature, for the facts given—the divinity of Christ—is the only one that lays proper claim on him as the only sufficient explanation (scientific if you please) of man's spiritual nature. To every doubter of the credentials of the Christian system, I reply as Philip did to Nathaniel, with absolute confidence that the subject will bear acquaintance: "Come and see."

I wish yet to speak of the evidence for the truth of the Christian religion in experience. As Flint says: "There is no truth more requiring to be borne in mind by the Christian Apologist than that Christianity is an essentially practical thing, and that, consequently, like every such thing, a real and sure knowledge of it can only be practically, experimentally acquired. No amount of proof, no accumulation of evidence, on behalf of Christianity can be trusted to produce an assured Christian faith, an entire, an active Christian certitude, in those who do not comply with its requirements as a moral and spiritual life—who do not so yield themselves to its influences as to experience its

practical power. This does not imply that Christian experience is a substitute for other evidence, or warrant us to dispense with other evidence. We cannot have Christian experience except by appropriation of Christian truth, and, if there be Christian truth to appropriate, that truth must have evidences by which it may be recognized and by which experience is enlightened and sustained. Yet none the less is the true path to an assured certainty of Christian truth the practical realization of it in the life. So experience testifies. And it only confirms the words of the Master, 'My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.' "

Space forbids citing personal testimony here to any great extent. But this is something not hard to find and that which will be most conclusive will be that sought out by the inquirer himself. John G. Paton's personal testimony to the writer as to the condition of his emotions in times of extreme peril to which he was often subjected in the New Hebrides, is: "I knew God would keep me from harm or do something better." In the early part of the century Africaner, a powerful savage chief of Central Africa, was won to Christ by the preaching of Robert Moffat. Africaner, dying as a Christian after having proved the reality of his regeneration by years of earnest Christian zeal leaves this testimony: "My former life is stained with blood; but Jesus Christ has bought my pardon, and I am going to heaven."

A noted professor of science recently gave this personal testimony. He was in conversation with acquaintances of his younger days. They knew him to have been sceptical concerning matters of religion. They were surprised at his conversation turning with such reverence to the subject of his own personal faith in Christianity. They asked him to tell what had wrought the change. His response was: My mother was a devout believer in Christ. I knew her profession was honest. When she died commending me to the love and tender mercy of her God I resolved that as a scientific man I could not afford to condemn such a mother's religion without a thorough inves

tigation. The result is my conversion to the faith in the divine Jesus who has redeemed my soul.

"One of the ablest and purest skeptical critics of the century, De Wette, made the sad but honorable confession :

I lived in times of doubt and strife,
When childlike faith was forced to yield;
I struggled to the end of life,
Alas! I did not gain the field.

"But he did gain the field at last ; for a few months before his death he wrote and published this significant sentence : 'I know that in no other name can salvation be found, than in the name of Jesus Christ the crucified, and there is nothing higher for mankind than the divine humanity realized in him, and the kingdom of God planted by him.' " (Schaff.)

These references to personal testimony taken from totally different circumstances of life, witnessing to the identical truth to which the voice of united Christendom bears corroborative testimony, are nothing less than the testimony from these witnesses that in their religious experience they each have what to them is practical demonstration that the "power not ourselves which makes for righteousness" is the divine in the Christian religion. This testimony comes from the noblest specimens of the race. These have contributed the highest blessings upon humanity which humanity enjoys. It is unscientific to disregard the evidence of their testimony. On the other hand science is under obligation to accept the evidence as conclusive, unless it can displace it with some hypothesis which will better harmonize the spiritual requirements and relations of man. This is its universal policy in other matters, and it cannot evade responsibility here. We claim that the Christian belief, as witnessed to by the fruits of every variety of mankind, the savage, the pagan, the professed unbeliever, and the Christian, has every presumption in its favor, which, as Butler says, "in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation." Our conclusion, therefore, is that the power that moves Princes to acknowledge the humblest peasant as his brother, the most favored of earth to extend his hand to the rudest savage, and say, come,

my brother, and share my blessings, is the divine Jesus Christ. To the objector outside the circle of believers who says this is not demonstration, we say, come in and see. If he would depreciate belief as compared with knowledge I answer that all knowledge is dead only so far as it serves for inference to awaken belief, *for belief, not knowledge, is the spring of action. Belief is therefore master, and knowledge is slave. Belief is the way of life opening out before us moment by moment; knowledge is the bundle of thorns and roses we have plucked by the way. We must carry our knowledge; our belief carries us. I repeat, by comparison in so far as there is distinction between knowledge and belief, the former is dead form and matter, the latter is the breath of life.* If he would argue that it would take a man a lifetime to complete such an investigation, I answer, that is true, and I should regard the investment of lifetime for life eternal, a good contract. But the sceptic may still retort, But what if you should then lose, I bow my acknowledgements, and ask, What is there to lose?

Let us now summarize our conclusions. We have found that the Gospel of Christ effectually regenerates the Cannibals; it convinces Christendom of the universal need of redemption, and furnishes the impulse to attempt the redemption of the race; it is the conviction of Christendom that the redemption of the race is possible only by the power of the Gospel; the Gospel of Christ demonstrates its power to supply the want among pagan nations; in the experiences of men it is witnessed to as being "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." There is, therefore, manifest in the history of our own times and in the experiences of men of our own times, conclusive evidence that the Gospel of Christ operates in the nineteenth century with results identical with those of the first century of the Christian era. If we could cut the century loose from the preceding ages and look at it with all our knowledge of preceding times left blank, without chronologies or history save only the New Testament, we would have to find the explanation of the age in the record of the divine life it portrays. To attempt a picture of humanity without the New

Testament and without its fruits, and without reference to it, would be very like an attempt to picture the earth without the sun and its influences; it would be "without form and void." As astronomy requires the law of gravitation in order to explain the harmony of the spheres, geology the evolutionary theory to explain the periods of earth-formation, psychology a personal age to explain mind, religion requires Jesus Christ to explain person and spirit.

A word in conclusion as to how far this evidence reaches towards proving Jesus divine. The gospel must stand or fall by the strength or weakness of its central thought—the divine Jesus revealing the love of God for the redemption of humanity. It cannot be disputed that the power manifestly operating was from above, for all it has to tell is of things higher than those natural to man. It gives a conception of God which satisfies and harmonizes; it teaches and reveals a morality that is higher than man has anywhere accomplished of himself; its doctrine of immortality is complete; its worship is the expression of the relation between the creature and the Creator; these require us to postulate of him that brought the revelation that he is divine. He rests the validity of his revelation upon his divine origin. He promises what his revelation shall accomplish. It accomplishes what he promises. We cannot acknowledge the one and reject the other.

I am not conscious of having overstated any truth. My aim has not been to boast of the glory of the Christian religion, but rather to show that in our times we have evidence with all the balance of probability in favor of the divinity of Christ, in such a way that an unbeliever is necessarily on the defensive when he assails the truth of the Christian religion.

I conclude with a quotation from Dr. Storr's "Divine Origin of Christianity:" "The Christian faith seems to me to glorify life, it seems to me to banish the shadow of gloom from death, to feel that the majestic figure—of Brother, Teacher, Friend, Redeemer—which towers supremely over the centuries, which made the earth sublime by its advent, which seemed in ascend-

ing to unite it to the heavens, has equal place in worlds to come! That we may trust his imperative word; that we may serve his kingly cause; that we may see the illumined universe, for us as for him, a house of victory and of peace; that we may stand, by and by, with him, amid the light as yet unreached, and say, each one: I believed in thy religion; I saw its triumphs in the earth; I felt its power in my heart; I rose to God in love upon it; I foreknew by it, what now I find—Eternal life!"

ARTICLE IV.

THE COVENANT PEOPLE AND THEIR PART IN THE PROMISES.

By REV. J. F. POLLOCK.

It is of great importance, in biblical interpretation, to determine the essential character of the people of God under all dispensations. If the promises of God in the Old Testament are to a race, then there is a marked difference in the two Testaments. If those promises are not to a race, but to a people organized into a corporate community the uniting bond of which was faith in God revealing himself in his grace and goodness to sinful man, then there is harmony between the two Testaments; and if the faith of the Old Testament looked forward to a Messiah, and trained the people to see and rest upon him for salvation, then when the Messiah appears, the people of God will be the people receiving him as their head, and depending upon him, in all his offices, for life and blessedness. All the promises of God will then be yea and amen, to the covenant people of Christ, and Abraham will be the father of the whole body of the faithful.

And the first important consideration bearing on the subject is the character of the community of which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were successively the heads.

Annexed to the call of Abram was the promise in which God engaged to make him a great nation (Gen. 12 : 2); and this pro-

mise was repeated to the patriarch (18 : 18), and to Jacob (35 : 11). When the latter went down to Egypt he was informed that the promise was to be fulfilled in that land (46 : 3). The greatness of the nation consisted in two very comprehensive particulars : First, God was near to the people in all that they might call upon him for ; secondly, the nation had revealed to them a righteous law for their government and training (Deut. 4 : 8).

Now a nation (*goi*) is a corporate community, and the same term used in the promise to Abram and to Jacob is applied to the nations generally and is translated by the terms, nations, Gentiles and heathen. As a corporate community there is no contrast between the nation Abram was to become, and the other nations of the earth. The contrast is altogether in the character of the bond uniting the members of the community.

From one of the branches of the Semitic peoples, Abram was called out of a condition of previous idolatry (Jos. 24 : 2) to become an elect community, the members of which were bound together by faith in God revealing himself to them from time to time, as the community needed revelation and as they were able to receive it (Heb. 1 : 2). He was seventy-five years of age when he entered Canaan as a childless man, at the head of a nomadic community. After a brief sojourn in Egypt, he and Lot parted company, because they had grown too great to dwell peaceably together, on account of the disputes of their servants. A short time after the separation, when Lot was taken captive by the enemy which invaded the vale of Sodom and the neighboring cities, Abram was able to arm 318 trained servants to rescue his nephew (Gen. 14 : 14). The haste with which these were armed and the enemy overtaken before the northern boundry of Canaan was reached, suggests that these trained servants were a sort of standing army, and that Abram had others beside them in his community. Sarah's maid, Hagar, was an Egyptian, and as Pharaoh had given Abram men-servants as well as women servants, some of the male community would be made up of Egyptians. His eldest servant was from Damascus, and the community under Abraham may

have been made up of elements from all the peoples between the Euphrates and the Nile. Halévy derives the name Abram from abir, chief, and am, people, and, whatever be the character of the derivation, the position assigned to Abram, when he was called, is undoubted.

In the seventeenth chapter of Genesis this community is taken into covenant relations, and to Abram and his seed God engaged to be "a God," to give them the land of Canaan for an everlasting (olam) possession, and this covenant was to be sealed and signified by circumcision, which was to be in their flesh for an everlasting (olam) covenant. All born in Abraham's house, or bought with his money were to be circumcised, and the uncircumcised soul was to be cut off from his people. That same day, "Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among men of Abraham's house, and circumcised them in the self same day God had said unto him." Abraham himself was circumcised that same day, being ninety-nine years of age. It is in connection with entering into this covenant that Abraham was promised that God would make him a father of many nations, and his name was changed in token of the covenant relation and the destiny appointed to him. Now this covenant community is a community, none of whom are Abraham's seed in any physical sense, excepting Ishmael, and with the divine sanction, he was subsequently separated from it (Gen. 21 : 12). Thus the covenant community at the beginning was a community bound together by the faith of its head.

But more than that, the promise of a son by Sarah is a promise annexed to that covenant, and when Isaac was born, he was born into a community having its fundamental character already established, and under the law of it. In those days, nations were small communities and theocratic in their character. The god acknowledged by the nation, as its invisible ruler, had for his representative the earthly ruler, and before Abraham's day, the kings of Egypt were wont to style themselves sons of Amen, Ra, or Phath. But the hereditary king was subject to the hereditary religion, and Amenhotop IV, belonging to the

eighteenth dynasty, found that he could not readily reform the religion of Egypt. (*History of the East* by Lenormant and Chevallier, p. 237, Vol. 1).

The community of which Abraham was the head had been under divine training ever since Terah immigrated from Ur of the Chaldees, and when Abraham was ninety-nine the time had come for it to become organized under the bonds of that revelation which had been made to it from time to time since the patriarch began his sojourning. From the Euphrates to the Nile, and back again to Canaan, in scenes of peace and in scenes of strife, the community had seen their chief under divine guidance and protection, and they were ready to become a theocratic community under Abraham as God's representative. No doubt the faith of Abraham was far in advance of the members of the tribe, but the account of Eliezer's journey to Padan-Aram would indicate that he also was a man of faith, and one to whom Abraham could commit the destinies of his house.

The headship of Abraham was continuous for at least a hundred years, and during that time he commanded his house to keep the ways of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord might bring upon him all he had spoken (18 : 19). Thus when Isaac was born there was a community which had been under divine training for many years, and had formally entered into covenant with God. Such a community had an interest in preserving the revelations committed to it, and the successive heads came to their office under the law of the community, and for the purpose of guiding it in the way of obedience. Isaac was born to headship in the covenant community; and before Abraham died, he sent away all who might dispute the headship with Isaac, and gave to that son all that he had. Thus the Abrahamic community was not one bound together by ties of blood, but by faith in God revealing himself through Abraham.

The covenant people preserved the same character during the headship of Isaac. He was forty when he was married, and sixty when his twin sons were born, and when Abraham died the boys were fifteen years old. During his life he was prosperous, had a great store of servants (Gen 26 : 14) and was

greater than any of the lords of the Philistines among whom he sojourned (16), so that Abimelech thought it prudent to enter into a treaty with him and exchange oaths in ratification of it (31). With Isaac God renewed the promise to Abraham, and engaged to multiply his seed for Abraham's sake (24). Though he lived 180 years he never had but the two sons, and of these Jacob was chosen to succeed him in the headship of the covenant community (28 : 4),

The manner in which Jacob received the blessing of Abraham from his father necessitated a sojourn in Padan-Aram, and after a sojourn of 21 years he returned to Canaan with men servants and women servants (32 : 5). When Simeon and Levi pillaged Shechem the women and children were added to the covenant community (34 : 29), and when Esau departed from Canaan, the brothers had become so great that the land could not bear them (36 : 6, 7). Ten years later Jacob went down to Egypt with all that he had (46 : 1, 47 : 1). He was one hundred and thirty when he stood before Pharaoh (47 : 9), and 215 years had passed away since Abraham had crossed the Euphrates, one half of the 430 years from that event till the Exodus (Ex. 12 : 41); and when two more generations should have passed away the time of deliverance from Egypt would be due (Gen. 15 : 16).

The unreadable story of Judah (c. 38) indicates that the time was ripe for some change in the family of Jacob. Who were the wives of Jacob's sons, we are not informed, except in the cases of Joseph and Judah, and the former was a daughter of the priest of On, and the wife of the latter was of the daughters of the Canaanites. The critics of the present day think that under the figure of marriage and assignation, union with Canaanite tribes may be signified; but be that as it may, it is a matter of record that Judah's daughter-in-law, and the mother of his two sons, Pharez and Zerah, was a Canaanite, and an ancestress of our Lord's humanity. In the descent to Egypt a distinction is to be made between "all that Jacob had," and his immediate descendants—the latter, counting himself and Joseph and his sons, being seventy souls (46 : 6-27).

Had this been the whole community of Jacob it is exceedingly unlikely that a district as large as Goshen, some 60 geographical square miles, would have been assigned to them, and altogether impossible, without miracle, that they should have overflowed it in 215 years, and become a people numbering 603,550 fighting men, besides 22,000 Levites, from a month old and upwards (Num. 2 : 32, 3 : 39). Population is thought to be capable of doubling itself every 25 years, though we have no reliable account of any community having increased at such a rate. But if Jacob's progeny had thus increased, their numbers would have been a long way short of one half of those numbered at Sinai. We must therefore conclude that the people numbered at Sinai was the increase of the whole community of which Jacob was the covenant head, and of this people Jacob was the eponymous ancestor, and his twelve sons bore the same relation to the tribes into which the covenant people was divided.

A proof of this will be found by inspecting the seventy souls which came out of the loins of Jacob. It is made up of four generations, in the first of which is Jacob; in the second Jacob's twelve sons and one daughter; in the third, 51 grandsons, and one grand-daughter; and in the fourth, four great grandsons. It is scarcely probable that in twelve families, having an aggregate issue of 51 sons, there should be only one daughter, and only two females in the issue of three generations. How can we account for only two females in this number of seventy? The answer that seems to me to agree with scripture representations is that it is made up to show the relation of the covenant community to all the families of the earth.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis seventy nations are spoken of as inhabiting the earth. From one of those nations Abraham was called to become a great nation, that in him they might all be blessed. The mediatorial headship of Abraham is brought out in his intercessory prayer for Sodom, and in his intercession for Abimelech, where he is called a prophet (Gen. 20 : 7). In Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the headship of the covenant community was personal, and the promises to Isaac and Jacob are for Abraham's sake. With Jacob the headship in an individual

ceases, and the nation itself becomes the representative nation in relation to the seventy nations which are regarded ideally as inhabiting the earth. So it is called Jehovah's son, even his first-born (Ex. 4 : 22), and in Hosea (4 : 6) a priestly position is assigned to it. As there were not enough of males to make up the number to seventy, two females were added to the 68 males, and the community which goes down to Egypt is thus represented as the priestly community chosen of God to stand between him and a dark world, and receive light from him to shed upon its darkness (Ex. 19 : 4-6). Hence the home of the nation was to be midway between the centers of the ancient civilization which controlled the destinies of the ancient world till the rise of the Greeks and the conquests of Alexander turned the march of civilization westward, and prepared for the Apostles and their successors the language of the gospels. Jacob did not leave the blessing of Abraham to any one of his sons, but the nation itself became the mediatorial community, and the Messianic promise was to be realized in the tribe of Judah.

Hence the number seventy represents the priestly character of the nation, and it was seventy of the elders of Israel who beheld the vision of God's glory at Sinai (Ex. 24 : 1, 9, 10), and seventy elders were chosen to be filled with the spirit of Moses, that they might bear the rule of Israel with him (Num. 11 : 16-17, 24-29), and serve as a check upon the individual rulers of the covenant people, during the time of their representative office. It was this body who inquired of John the Baptist his authority, and received testimony concerning Christ (John 1 : 19-29); and it was this body which rejected Jesus as the Messiah, and sought to kill him at the end of his Judean ministry (5 : 18). They sat in Moses seat, and because of their rejection of the Lord of the vineyard, the kingdom of God was to be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21 : 43). To represent this priestly position of the chosen community the progeny of Jacob descending to Egypt is made up to seventy, and of these, his twelve sons became the eponymous ancestors of the twelve divisions of the whole community, and his grand-sons, and great-grand-sons be-

came the eponymous ancestors of smaller divisions within the tribes.

Let the 74,600 warriors of the tribe of Judah be taken, as they were numbered at Sinai a year after the Exodus, and how can that number be thought of as the natural increase of Judah and his three sons in 215 years from the descent to Egypt? The Bible does not hint at anything miraculous, and the Bible miracles are never of a kind, which requires such a tax upon our ideas of that which is possible. But it is well to notice that the Kenites and the Kenizzites appear first among those tribes whose lands God promises to the seed of Abraham in four generations (Gen. 15 : 19), and these appear among the ancestors of the great houses of Judah (1 Chron. 2 : 55, 4 : 12-15); and as Caleb belonged to the latter people, it seems that, before the Exodus, the Kenizzites were received into the tribe of Judah on the same footing as the purest blood in that tribe.

Nor were all the years spent in Egypt years of oppression. Some of Judah's eponymous progeny broke away from a nomadic life, and learned the arts of civilization, and during that time some of them made a settlement in the land of Moab (1 Chron. 4 : 22-23). The same is true of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Chron. 7 : 20-24), and we are told that a mixed multitude, or people, shared in the deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 12 : 38). When the tribes were numbered at Sinai these disappear, and no doubt, they were incorporated among the tribes. A door of entrance into the fellowship of Israel was always open to the stranger (Ex. 12 : 48, 49), and no nationality was excluded, saving the Moabites and the Ammonites, and that exclusion was only for a time. Thus the Israel of God in the Old Testament was a community in which there were none of the patriarch's physical seed at its formation, and at the Exodus, the literal descendants of Jacob in the nation taken into covenant relations with God at Sinai, were comparatively few.

The name Israel is thought to mean, God persists, and it was applied to Jacob at Peniel, because there he appeared as a man in whom God had been persisting, and the divine persistence

was seen in the man, who, while he used all means to placate the wrath of an offended brother, yet looked to God to make all successful, and all alone wrestled by the restless Jabock for the divine favor to be manifested in him. And it is in his character as a man in whom the divine persistence has brought forth fruit, that he becomes the eponymous ancestor of that community in whose history, the history of the only begotten Son of God was to be foreshadowed, and the world prepared to welcome his advent.

When we come to the conquest of the land of Canaan, we find that Rahab and her father's house were incorporated into the tribe of Judah, and her name also appears in the genalogy of Mary's Son. Comparatively few of the cities of the Canaanites were taken and their inhabitants exterminated under Joshua. A foot-hold was given to each tribe, and their inheritance indicated by the lot, but their possession of it depended upon their faithful obedience. Coming among a civilized people with chariots and fenced cities, the invaders took possession of the mountains and hill-tops, where the chariots and horsemen could not be well used, and satisfied with their first successes, they rested from their warfare. Thus they made peace with the Canaanites, and the record is that "they dwelt among them, and took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods" (Jud. 3 : 5, 6). The two peoples thus gradually became one, and shared in the same chastisements for their sins, and in the same mercy which turned to the cry of penitence and granted deliverance. The covenant people had let their opportunity escape, and made covenants with the Canaanites, and so God gave the Canaanite people a place in the land, and spared them to prove Israel by their means. It appears that Israel was the weaker people in numbers, and in northern Israel, in the time of Deborah, the Canaanites came near to securing the mastery (Jud. 5 : 6). For a time a semi-Canaanitish state was set up in Shechem, and Abimelech was prince over Israel for three years (9 : 22). The tribe of Dan did not obtain a settlement in the land the lot gave them, and, in the time of a grand-son of Moses, went to the northern

part of the land, conquered Laish, and called at Dan, and there set up an idolatrous worship (18 : 30). Jerusalem was held by the Jebusites till the time all the tribes united to make David King, and thus for nearly or a little more than four hundred years the people brought out of Egypt were assimilating the inhabitants of Canaan and gradually becoming one people. Hence Saul's assault upon the Gibeonites was regarded as such an infraction of right that the land became blood guilty (2 Sam. 21 : 1, 2). In the services of Saul, Edomites are found, and Philistines in David's; and Uriah the Hittite, and Arunan the Jebusite were Israelites in faith. So we find David estimating his own position thus :

"Thou has made me the head of the nations :

A people whom I have not known shall serve me.

The strangers shall submit themselves unto me,

As soon as they hear of me they shall obey me."

(2 Sam. 22 : 44, 45).

It is not all figure Ezekiel uses when he says : "Thus saith the Lord God unto Jerusalem, thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan ; thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite" (16 : 3, 45). The kingdom of David was largely a Canaanite kingdom, and in the time of Solomon all the subject peoples had been incorporated into Israel except 156,600, and after his day these, for the most part, seem to have been absorbed.

Solomon's numerous marriages, his commercial enterprises and building operations, were a farther reaching out to the nations, and while it brought foreign customs into the nation, and made Jerusalem the shrine of other gods besides Jehovah, it also made David and his reign ideal of better things to come, and gave definiteness to national hopes. The division of the empire of David into two kingdoms tended to conserve religious hopes, and when the Northern Kingdom introduced innovations the godly gathered into the kingdom of Judah and strengthened it. Thus a purer religious community was formed, and Jerusalem became the seat of Jehovah's kingdom over all the nations

in and around the covenant community, and from Zion his judgments were sounded forth to them all (Amos I. and II). On the eve of the fall of the Northern Kingdom the escaped of Israel found a refuge in Judah (Is. 4 : 2), and during the Assyrian invasion remnants from Philistia (Is. 14 : 30), Moab 16 : 14, and Syria (17 : 3), came into the Southern Kingdom, and formed a new Israel. With the fall of the kingdom of Ephraim, Hezekiah became the head of the covenant community, and at the Passover he celebrated, a multitude of people came from the tribes inhabiting the northern portion of the land, and among them were strangers to join themselves to the Lord (2 Chron. 30 : 18, 25). Thus the people of Judah became an Israel and are so called by the prophets and in the later histories.

In the Chaldean invasion the nations around the covenant community were to be chastened, but like Israel, were to be returned to their territories, and have another opportunity to learn the ways of God's people (Jer. 12 : 14-17). A hope of return from exile was given, only to those of Judah carried away with Jehoiakin in 597 B. C. (29 : 16-20), and God's thoughts of peace concerning them were to give them hope and a latter end (Marg. R. V., verse 11). The duration of the captivity of the Northern Kingdom was to be 390 years, according to the Hebrew text of Ezekiel, 350, according to the LXX., and the duration of the captivity of Judah 40 years (Ezek. 4 : 4, 6). During that time both elements of the covenant community were under instruction by the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and in the wilderness of chastisement an Israel was reconstructed (Hos. 2 : 14, 15). A general invitation was given by Cyrus to all who desired to do so to return to the land of Canaan (Ezra 1 : 1-4), and those who embraced it were the children of Israel (3 : 1). God did not leave those who remained in the empire of Persia, but delivered them from dangers, so that when their neighbors saw that God was with them, many became Jews (Esth. 8 : 7). Thus covenant communities were preserved in heathen lands, and these prepared the way of the Apostles and made it possible that in a single generation the gospel could be preached and churches established in all parts of the Roman Empire. In the

time of the Maccabees, the Idumeans, a different people altogether from the ancient Edomites, became Jews by an enforced circumcision (Joseph. Antiq. XIII, ix, 1); and from this people came the Herodian family, and 20,000 Idumeans came into Jerusalem during the Roman invasion, and perished with that guilty city (B. J. IV, iv-v).

It is thus plain, that as a matter of biblical history, the covenant community, God's Israel, was at no time, the natural progeny of the patriarchs, but at all times, it was the corporate community bound together by the faith of Abraham and under the government of a divinely appointed head. This headship was successively in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but after this the community became God's son, and under Moses as a typical mediator was brought out of bondage, and organized in the wilderness under a body of laws which had a promise of good things to come. Under David, the nation, in its elements, was largely Canaanitish, and he became the typical head of the nations, and the promise to Abraham concerning the multiplication of his seed became the promise to David (Jer. 32 : 22). The New Testament representations, which declare that they are Abraham's seed who have the faith of Abraham, is thus an Old Testament truth; and God's Israel, the covenant community of this present time is to be found in the communities accepting the headship of Jesus Christ.

If Jesus is not the Messiah, then the covenant people may be the people in our cities and on our streets who are called Jews, and who make some use of Old Testament rites, while they wait for a Messiah yet to come. But on that supposition, the Old Testament, must cease to be regarded as the sure word of prophecy, since the latter end hope of the community under the law began with the return from the Chaldean Captivity, and was to be realized under the latter house (Hag. 2 : 9). The moment that temple became a ruin, that very moment the Providence of God proved that the Messiah had come; and all past economies had their completion in that Messiah and the economy he established. He who was "set up from everlasting" and who had from time to time appeared in some supernaturally assumed

form, and thereby had given direction and authority to a typical and temporary economy, now came in the flesh; and whoever accepts the Old Testament as prophetic, must accept Jesus as the Messiah, whose day Abraham saw (John 8 : 56), whose reproach Moses chose (Heb. 11 : 26), and who followed the Israelites in the wilderness (1 Cor. 10 : 4).

It is commonly thought that the term, Church, is a New Testament idea, and that it has special relation to the Gentiles. But this is not the case. Isaac's blessing to Jacob indicated that he was to become a qahal of nations (Gen. 28 : 3), and this promise was ratified by El Shaddai at Luz (48 : 3). But qahal means the same as the Greek term *ekklesia*, and the LXX use the latter term most frequently to translate the Hebrew term qahal. In the twelve tribes we have the nations referred to in the blessing of Isaac and El Shaddai; and in those nations bound together by religious bonds, we have the qahal, the assembly or Church of God on earth.

When our Lord declared that he would build his Church on the rock of men confessing him (Matt. 16 : 18), the emphatic term is not the word church, but the pronoun, *my*, and that pronoun as referring to the Christ manifested in the flesh, and whom men thought of so differently. There was a Church in the wilderness of the wondering (Acts 7 : 38), and in the midst of it Christ was to cause the praises of God to be sung (Heb. 2 : 12). That Church was an "olive root" into which there had been much ingrafting during the history of the temporary economy; and when Christ came to his own things, and his own people rejected him, they proved that they were his own, only in a formal and outward sense. Hence his determination to build his Church on the rock of men confessing him from the revelation granted them by the Father in heaven. Thus the Church would continue to be what it ever had been, an assembly of mortals bound together by the operations of God's grace in the heart.

Christ began the building of such a Church immediately after his rejection by those who sat in Moses' seat. By his Galilean ministry, a body of disciples were gathered, and from

these he chose twelve men to be the nucleus of a new Israel. These he appointed to judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22 : 29, 30) and the Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2 : 20). From the body of his disciples he also sent our seventy evangelists (Luke 10 : 1), and the sending out of these indicated the same truth as the baptism and preaching of John Baptist, namely that those who thought of themselves as Abraham's seed, were in the same condition of moral and spiritual estrangement from God as the Gentiles. Hence Christ gives to his disciples the same outward organization as that in the Old Testament which indicated the Israel of God as a priestly people chosen to mediate between him and the world in darkness; and it is this feature of the Church which receives special emphasis in the New Testament (1 Pet. 2 : 9). The universalism of the Old and the New Testaments has the same root in God's love and grace toward men, and Christ is the world's Saviour.

In forms essentially the same as those which indicated the choice of Israel as a priestly people at Sinai, and pointing out their God-chosen representatives (Numb. 11 : 16, 17, 25, 26; 1 Sam. 10 : 6, 10; 16 : 13), the whole body of disciples of Christ was pointed out as the people of God, according to the preintimation of Moses (Numb. 11 : 29); and the lesson of Pentecost is not that the Holy Spirit was given once for all to the Church, but that the Church was pointed out once for all, as the Israel of God, the fulness of Christ, and the one body to which God bore witness by all the spiritual gifts which had characterized the Old Testament people.

A time, in God's forbearance, was given to the people of the old economy to leave the fellowship of the Sanhedrin, and join themselves to the body of which the Apostles were the heads; and among them the Apostles were supernaturally preserved and directed to stand in the temple and preach to them "all the words of this life" (Acts 5 : 20). Thus, out of Israel, soon to perish as an outward community existing under the institutions

of Moses, a Church of Christ was built up, and into it, the Gentiles were brought as fellow citizens (Eph. 2 : 19).

It is this Church which is called "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6 : 16), Abraham's seed (3 : 29), the circumcision (Phil. 3 : 3), and every endearing term, and every endearing relation applied to the Old Testament people of God, is in the New Testament applied to believers in Christ. All that is merely Jewish is spoken of with something bordering on contempt. The ordinances of the law are carnal ordinances, established by a carnal commandment. They are weak and beggarly elements, and circumcision is a mere concision. Those who say they are Jews, are not, but do lie, and are of the synagogue of Satan (Rev. 3 : 9). Jerusalem becomes Sodom and Egypt, "where also our Lord was crucified" (11 : 8). In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, and the doctrine of the Apostles is that Jews and Gentiles can find salvation in precisely the same way (Acts 15 : 11).

There is thus unity in both Testaments, and faith, not blood, is the uniting bond of the people of God. Those whom we may call Jews, cannot be said to have any race connection with the patriarchs; and if there were promises in the Bible to the physical seed of Abraham, it would be as difficult to find them, as to find the drops of the dew in the ocean.

Since the fall of the outward institutions of Moses, there may be a people who are the corporate successors of those opposed to Christ and his Apostles; and the Judaism into which the Early Church soon fell, and their acceptance of the Roman government as a theocratic power to defend and extend the faith of the Church, may have kept the persecuted synagogue comparatively free from intermixture with other peoples. The consequence may be that those whom we call Jews are in a great degree the pure descendants of the people to whom Christ came, and who are largely rationalistic in their faith, and accept neither Moses nor Jesus as God's messengers. Thus their separate existence can be accounted for, and no doubt it will continue, as long as there is anything like persecution of them, and so long as the Church continues to teach that God's promises are to a race, and that a race may have rights which

God is bound to respect, no matter what its moral state may be. With all plainness of speech the Bible declares, that where the faith of Abraham is, there the children of Abraham are, and there are the heirs of the promises.

With such a faith, God's Israel must go forward, and realize that in all its activities Christ is in the midst, and goes forth with her missionaries "conquering and to conquer." Now as of old the Church's witnesses may have their baptism of blood to suffer, but its ultimate victory is certain, and under the cross as the symbol of our faith, the one family of God will continue to be constrained by the love of Christ, till the One body is completed and perfected, and Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

ARTICLE V.

THE DISCOURAGEMENTS AND ENCOURAGEMENTS OF A CITY PASTORATE.

BY REV. F. M. PORCH, D. D.

Neither the subject of this paper, nor my experience will require the recital of anything striking or original. My ministry has had no unusual features. Our trials, we all have in common; our triumphs, we cannot deem worthy of record, but our difficulties we may mention for mutual profit, and our joys we may recount for inspiration and encouragement.

Ideally, perhaps there ought to be no discouragements to the minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He is a co-worker with God. We weary in well-doing and faint at times when we ought to rejoice as a strong man to run a race. The calling of the preacher is the noblest calling that God has ever been pleased to bestow upon human beings. The work of the Christian ministry is one that is much to be desired. It is as laudable, as honest, as noble and as delightful an ambition as ever was put before the minds of men.

Paul says: "I thank him that enabled me, even Christ Jesus, our Lord, for that he counted me faithful, appointing me to his ministry,"

Rutherford exclaims: "I think I would rather beg my bread, all the laboring days of the week, for an opportunity of publishing the gospel on the Lord's day, than, without that privilege, to enjoy the richest possessions on earth."

The man, called of God to proclaim the gospel to a lost world, who would leave the pulpit for the throne of Great Britain or for the presidency of the United States, would stoop.

He, whose arm is strong enough to support the weak, the song of whose voice can hush, if for but a moment, the sighings of distress, and whose heart can spare one chord from its own grief to throb responsively to the woes of others, has a calling that would not degrade an angel.

But to say that the regular work of the ministry has no discouraging features in it would be to claim angelic relationship too ethereal for most Lutheran preachers.

There *are* discouragements in the ministry; discouragements dependent no more upon the nature of the obstacles to be overcome than upon the nature of the man and the people with whom he deals.

Obstacles that throw some men into spasms of discouragement, serve other men only as a season of amusement. Some men can laugh out of countenance, opposition, that other men would either have to run away from or to knock down and drag out.

Some young ministers may have an honest contempt for Elijah's throwing himself in a fit of despondency under the soothing shades of that juniper tree, on account of the infuriated Jezebel; but they will not be in the ministry long until they learn from similar experiences to have lots of sympathy for Elijah, and that a real comforting effectual juniper tree would sometimes be "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

To be born in America, where the majority is supposed to rule, to be trained in the belief that all men are created free and equal, which is at least doubtful, educated in a college where free

thought and free speech and free research are the acme of privilege; with a heart and an intellect consecrated to God and eager for the advancement of his kingdom, possibly lacking in worldly wisdom and experience; to become the pastor of a church and for a few blessed short years to be fondled and petted and lionized by old and young, and then suddenly to find one's self confronted by one of those proud, haughty, indispensable rich men, who is self-made, and worships his maker, and assumes to own the preacher, and looks upon the church to which he belongs as his own little vest-pocket precinct, to do his bidding; or to run up against one of those little bullet-headed, stubborn, dictatorial autocrats or congregational bullies, whose own good will and pleasure are his only recognized law or conscience—such experiences soon render the preacher painfully conscious that there are discouragements in the ministry and that while he has a religion that reaches to the skies, it also stands on the ground, and for a good distance up its sides bears marks that indicate its contact with that which is of the earth earthy.

To an honest, energetic young man entering the ministry, the place of his pastorate, in many particulars, will make but little difference.

Some men will do all in their power, no matter whether they labor in the country or in the city. The amount of work to be done is mountainous, it is as wide as the human race and to such men, the amount of work accomplished is limited only by their own strength.

No doubt in a city pastorate, the amount of work that cannot be slighted or postponed or entirely set aside without detriment, is greater than in smaller places; and this essential work is dependent, not on the size of the congregation, but upon the size of the city. Cities have more in them of everything that is wicked and demoralizing, and they need more of everything that is good and uplifting.

In proportion to the expenses of living, the financial support of the city minister is far from being as good as that of those who labor in smaller places. Business, in the city, is much more intense and strictly exacting, and congregations are not

proverbial for the prompt payment of salaries, making it difficult for the average city minister always to meet his financial obligations, and that too in a place where a man's character is estimated, not by his professed piety, but by his ability promptly to pay his debts. No matter how honest or conscientious he may be, no matter how much others may be responsible for his empty purse, the minister's reputation and influence are damaged and may be ruined by unpaid bills.

The wise minister will resolutely, stubbornly and persistently avoid debt, as he avoids death, unless he is willing to invite a horrid spectre continually to dog his heels and possibly to be the assassin of his own happiness and reputation.

These things, though apparently trivial, will be found in many cases to be the principal, although, perhaps, the unacknowledged causes of pastoral removals. A preacher in a recent issue of his parish paper, was possibly more truthful than discreet in the following announcement :

"The pastor hereby announces that he has bought the Charles Slagel property, two doors north of the church. He will move the first of April. He has paid \$50 of the price, and only has \$2,050 to pay yet. I suppose by the time he gets the rest paid, his course will about be run in the congregation, and he will have to leave it. Such is the fate of all preachers, except some who have the courage to stay and fight and smell fire and brimstone."

But we have now walked far enough in the dark, to "let a little sunshine in." Fortunately there is another phase of ministerial life.

The history of the Church is a record of noble, heroic deeds, done by faithful, consecrated women, who are the minister's most sympathetic helpers, true as steel, ready at any time to parry a cruel criticism, to protect his good name, and like angels of light in many a dark hour, to cheer his heart by teaching him lessons of patience and trust.

Men there are also in every congregation, who love their pastor sincerely, who are ready to walk where he walks, and to suffer when he suffers, and with a benevolence born of God, to

sacrifice time and pleasure, prejudice and money, that they may help him in his work and promote the advancement of the cause of God, in which they are as loyal as any man who ever wore the priestly robe.

Generally the majority of the men and women of every congregation, under all circumstances and at all times encourage their pastor.

In no social club, in no business relation, in no fraternal institution, can you find the friendship of David and Jonathan more literally exemplified, than in the bonds of love that unite the pastor to the majority of the men and women in his parish.

Even the discomforts of meager salaries are largely compensated for by the superior privileges, advantages and opportunities afforded to him and his family by the exalted position which the minister occupies.

Though he may not ride in so fine a turn-out or decorate his bosom with so costly a diamond, he can manage to get round over the city, for he generally has two good strong legs and he can walk; and he may carry with him a conscience void of offense, which is always an invaluable jewel that shines brighter than any crystal; and though his children may not be able to dress so in the height of style or indulge in all the silly, sickly talk about the latest fashion, the last theatre, the divine dance, or the lovely eucher-party, they can be respectably and neatly clad; and when a man or a woman, no matter how exalted in position or intellect, enters the humble parsonage parlor, they can engage in modest, intelligent conversation with either of them without blushing or stammering, on account of having devoted more training to their heels than to their brains.

By reason of his honored position and noble character, the city minister often enjoys the association and confidence of the acknowledged masters of the commercial and industrious enterprises of the world, and thus is able to bring his sons and daughters to their favorable notice. These men are quick to discern in minister's children those, who by their rigid practice in economy and honesty, and by their training in the recognition of the rights of men and the fear of God, have had in

their humble preacher's home, a schooling that in an unusual manner, has fitted them to occupy positions of honor and trust and emoluments—as is amply attested, by the fact that more such positions are occupied by ministers children as a class, than by those of any other profession. Thus the very disadvantages of the minister's children ripen into blessings to them.

Any how, if there is one thing in this world for which a man should be more grateful than for another, it is the poverty which necessitates his starting in life under great disadvantages. Poverty is one of the best tests of human quality in existence. A triumph over it is like graduating with honor from the first college of the land. A man who cannot stand this test is not good for anything; he can never rise above a drudge. If he cannot feel his will harden, as the yoke of poverty presses upon him, and his pluck rise with every difficulty that it throws in his way, he may as well retire from the race. Poverty saves a thousand times more people than it ruins, and it saves multitudes, whom wealth would destroy. If any of you are so unfortunate as to be rich, you have my sympathy. You lack one great stimulus to effort and excellence, which your poor companion possesses. You will have to be very careful and work very hard, or you will find yourself outstripped in the race of life by your poor companion, before you know it. It is a very common occurrence in the city, to find a man, who once was the hired man, now occupying the place of the proprietor. This also is encouraging, for it is none the less true, that for the humble, diligent minister, there is always the cheerful hand of hope, pointing to the open door entering into yet greater fields of usefulness.

The minister, indeed, has a personal, private life of his own in the sacred companionship of his wife and children, in whose culture and prosperity he must be especially interested. Their joys and sorrows mingle with his and play a large part in his life, and in them he finds those who most effectually and willingly enter into all his hopes and fears. But flowery beds of ease, gold and silver, honor and favor, either for himself or them are not the objects for which he lives and labors.

His work leads on from his home-life to his life as a public servant. In the midst of all his personal joys and anxieties, he must so conduct himself and be so taught of God in humility, cheeriness and hopefulness that he may be an acceptable herald of glad tidings and an efficient messenger of the word of reconciliation.

The *intellectual labors* of the minister are very numerous and very arduous. Like the constantly flowing waters of the rivers, they never pass by. The continual accumulation of material for his regular sermons and numerous speeches for all kinds of subjects and times and occasions is a perpetual source of anxiety. The men, whose brilliant, original, spontaneous thoughts clamor for expression are read about but seldom seen or heard.

The only thing in this world that comes without hard labor is poverty. You must grind or have no flour. Our audiences are not content with mere maxims and truisms. They can no longer be edified with holy groanings and pious platitudes. The demands upon the resources of the preacher are increasing as civilization increases; and the members of our congregations, after a man shall have preached before them for five or ten years, unless he is a constant, diligent student, are very apt to find out, what he ought to have found out a great while before, that his little pond is quite shallow, and are liable to take such steps and resort to such methods as will lead them by the side of fresh waters.

The work of collecting material from every quarter of the heavens above and the earth beneath and the waters under the earth, ranging more or less through every profession, science and calling, but so prepared as to be infused with moral feeling and applied to all the experiences of men within and to all the wants of men without: this is no trifling contract, but a very large and exhausting work; and there are multitudes of ministers to whom it is an anxious, honest thought every week: "Oh, What shall I preach about next Sunday? It seems to me that I have told, several times over, about all that I know."

Men simply falter before the gigantic mental labors of the

ministry. They long for larger libraries, but they have not yet read half of the books they already possess. They need more knowledge; but they cannot use all of the little knowledge they already have. To fly through the bounds of the universe and come back to the pulpit with crude knowledge, some of it real and some of it imaginative, some of it certain and some of it doubtful, would be most dangerous folly. They must select from what they know those things that will help men to live better, otherwise they may be good lecturers, but never good preachers.

To preach all the things that they have conned during the week, though they be true, might unsettle men's minds and send them to destruction. "Thou shalt command them to bring the pure olive oil, beaten, for the light to cause the lamp to burn always," is ever with the true minister, an unrepealed law.

Assuming, however, without farther attempting to express the high intellectual demands of the ministry, which may or may not be an encouragement, one is not allowed to labor in this field unmolested. The minister has an ever present enemy in himself.

The weakness of human nature is a fruitful source of many discouragements, which, though many a time conquered, phoenix-like, rise again.

The minister is especially liable to be tempted to a life of *Indolence*. Unlike in the other professions, in his calling, there is no strict surveillance of his time. His preparations for the service of the Sanctuary may be quite partial, but his people are kind and will pardon, and but few of them know how he has spent his time.

The attorney has his clients continually prompting his energy, by inquiring into the progress of their cases; the physician must visit his patients, or the report of his negligence will speed through the community and injure him in his profession. The business man must be at his office, day after day. But though the minister has great interests at stake and

many clients and patients depend upon him, yet they utter no remonstrance, they make no report of his negligence.

The minister has no office hours, no system apparent to the public and possibly no system apparent to himself. He is in danger of wasting many precious hours in indolence; in danger indeed of wasting his entire life work by lack of systematic study. When his best and most vigorous years are gone—and they fly exceedingly fast—he finds himself either without any mental capital or in the midst of a debris of information in which he has no system and over which he has no command.

"Men have oft grown old among their books,
To die, case-hardened in their ignorance,
Whose careless youth had promised what long years
Of unremitting labor ne'er performed."

If he escapes this danger and is made of that fiber of which men are made, then he is most certain to meet another equally dangerous difficulty—this time from without—and clad in the garb of an angel of light. Nearly all of the benevolent, charitable and Christian work in the city is done by our most busy and active men and women.

If the minister's labors cannot be checked, they may be sidetracked, if his energies cannot be wholly thwarted, they can at least be dissipated. There are so many attractions to the city minister; he is in such easy access to the ever alluring book-stores, public libraries and art-galleries; opportunities to hear the best public speakers and leading educators of the land and the most experienced servants of the Church—the court-house with its fiery eloquence and battles of words, together with the many calls on every hand, so many meetings to attend, so many committees to meet, so many public services to render, so much financial and general management of the Church to look after, the kaleidoscope constantly shifting, all tending to dissipation of energy, making the minister a machine running a little local universe of his own and almost a stranger to his study. When he does return, his hours of devotion, of prayer and of meditation are invaded by the everlasting pull of the bell, the servant climbing up several flights of stairs to impart

to him the monotonous information that there is a gentleman in the parlor, who wants to see the doctor, and who forgot to give his name or specify the object of his weighty mission. Of course, the doctor must go down, for who knows but it is some fellow who wants to get married; and most city ministers have conscientious scruples and constitutional limitations, that forbid them to allow such fish to slip between the meshes.

And when he meets the various callers, he finds himself confronted by all varieties of the *genus home*, from the nealty-clad and very respectful agent to the poor unfortunate, pleading for bread for his hungry wife and children. And somehow the true minister, no matter what his early nature may have been, finally comes to look tenderly upon all such people and to see in them gems that needs only the touch of God's Spirit to ally them with the angels and to make them heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ; and therefore, precious time is easily consumed.

Often he must give a patient hearing to some one-eyed, halting stereoscopist, who has "the only enlightened and practical method of solving the evening service question and reaching the lapsed masses;" or to some poor, mistaken brother, who has a new scheme for redeeming the world in twenty-four hours; or who has been fore-ordained by a recent revelation to turn the world upside down, and wants to begin that work next Sunday morning in your pulpit—these are some of the specimens of ugly, outrageous bungling matters with which he is called upon to deal patiently, as they come and go, day by day, in the garb of angels of light.

Finally, late in the day, possibly late in the week, he begins the preparation of his sermon. As he sits in his study and at midday has not written a line because his thoughts will not flow, or when he burns his day's work because it is worthless, the minister looks out of the window and envies the workman, who, across the street, has completed, in the same time, so many feet of brick-work, which is as good as can be, and will last for many years, and then he returns to his desk discouraged because he cannot see the progress of his work, forgetful for the

time being that in all his work he must walk by faith and not by sight and that nothing done for God will come to naught.

But the sermon prepared for living beings must often be proclaimed to empty benches dotted here and there by the faithful few and the minister's power weakened before he begins by the feeling of "love's labor lost," because many of those for whom it was intended are not present.

This lecture must be original, at least in contrast with others of a similar character, which it has been my privilege to read, in this particular: I decline to discuss the comparative value of written and unwritten sermons. A certain minister was asked to preach to the prisoners in the Joliet Penitentiary, and was requested by the Warden not to preach on the Prodigal Son. "Why?" the minister asked. "Because" said the Warden, "by actual count the last seventeen preachers, who spoke to these prisoners, gave them the Prodigal Son and these poor fellows have about all of the Prodigal Son that they are able to stand." The minister concluded to be merciful and changed the topic.

For a similar reason I shall admit the value of both the written and the unwritten sermon. But the mere delivery of an address is very nerve-wasting and very debilitating. Some of the greatest divines that have occupied the pulpit in the past, such men as Drs. Bushnell, Channing, Robert Hall, Frederick Robertson and many other men of note—the delivery of a sermon that was charming to the audience kicked back and threw them on the ground in nervous exhaustion. A man may work all day long until he is so tired that he falls asleep, and not exhaust himself so much as the man does who uses the mind until his brain is excited and his vital force is expended, so that he cannot sleep, for brain-work is the hardest kind of work.

There are some men, whose ministrations, week by week, are a perpetual self-denial and sometimes border on the very edge of torture, as they labor night after night, toiling for hours, after other people are asleep, and outside of their own family and a few select friends, the only comfort and consolation, which they

get, is, "that fellow is no good. I heard him once, but if I ever get forgiven for it, I'll never hear him again."

There are few men in any rank of society, who work harder or longer than the average city minister. Two sermons a week, with all the incidental labors, would furnish employment enough, even in small churches for a pastor and an active assistant, and if the work of the ministry were a money-making institution, few ministers would be without their assistants. Clerical brains are the cheapest commodity in the market. The life of a clergyman is peculiar and unique and unless one is impelled by divine power, unendurable.

If any ordinary business man would exchange places with an ordinary minister they would probably both lessen the sum total of good accomplished and destroy their happiness and possibly shorten their lives.

The clergyman's life is a weary life, full of aches and pains and exasperations. He sees more of the under than of the upper side of human experience. If there is a skeleton in any family, it is generally exhibited, in all of its ghostly ghastliness, in his presence. If there is a feud in the neighborhood, it is generally brought to his attention.

The clergy are overworked and underpaid. They get a good deal of blame they do not deserve and not half the praise they do deserve.

I have made an effort to paint the discouragements of the ministry in flaming, but real colors, and without exaggeration.

But with a sufficient number of years of my life spent in the ministry to entitle me to at least the claim of an experience, I hesitate not to say, even in this presence, that personally and for personal selfish motives, I would never go into the ministry, if I could keep out of it.

I would not stay in the ministry, if I could get out of it.

But with the consciousness of divine guidance in my choice and life and of "woe be unto me if I preach not the gospel," the very elements in my nature, which I once thought disqualified me for the work of the ministry, have become my strongest sustaining forces; and the very trials of the ministry have be-

come an oriflamb, shining over my head and leading me with joy into the thickest of the fight. And with divine help all along the line—for he is never for a moment safe alone—with divine help, any honest, intelligent, consecrated man, called of God, having put his hand to the plow, can rejoice for the furrow already marked out, and for the seeds already sown, and for the harvests already gathered, and he need not look back until that day, when like Paul, whose very trials were among the causes of his rejoicing, he too can say :

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also, that love his appearing."

There never was a grander, holier or more delightful calling conferred upon mortal men, than the ministry of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but it must never be entered or continued for anything less or anything lower than the glory of God and the salvation and elevation of man.

Sometimes on Monday, the minister contrasts unfavorably his position intellectually with that of men in the other professions.

I have sometimes heard ministers tell how many thousands of dollars annually, they could have made if they had studied law. Ministers always make more money practicing law in their studies, than they would in their offices. If I had but a fraction of all the money, which I have made in my study by the machines which I have invented in imagination, but which never materialized, I would endow a college before the day closes.

I can easily understand the attractions of the legal profession and willingly accord due honor to the upright and high-minded lawyer, who is true to his calling. In his high vocation, he defends human rights against the treachery and villainy of wrong. As a peace-maker he mediates between angry disputants, and when the issue is inevitable, battles for principle and an impartial hearing for his client.

In the study and establishing of great principles, in the solution of vexed questions, the lawyer is engaged in a business that may well claim the energy and enthusiasm of any high-minded man.

But in all these respects the minister in his studies and in his labors may also rejoice. He too is concerned with human rights and human obligations, with the additional importance, that they belong to the soul's dignity and peace. He too is a jurist learned in law, but it is the eternal, unchanging law, which human legislators have not made and cannot annul, the law, whose seat is the bosom of God, whose voice is the harmony of the world.

In the administration of this law, the minister is the commissioned expounder and the authorized counsellor advising, adjusting and doing the gracious work of peacemaker between man and man and declaring peace between man and God.

As an advocate, he pleads in the forum of conscience and at the bar of God's mercy. Compared with the tribunals before which he pleads all others are insignificant; with the issues which he pursues, all the proceedings of earthly courts are trifles.

How worthy also of highest esteem, is the skilled and true physician. He deals with the maladies of the body; the minister with the maladies of the soul. Perhaps in no department of scientific investigation has there been more of laborious and patient research, than by the generous, high-minded physicians, who out of love for their profession and pity for suffering men, have persued their noble calling with heroic self-denial and often at the risk of life. And yet how little has been learned of diseases and their cure? But with the soul and its functions and diseases, the Christian minister is far more intimately acquainted, and the result is that notwithstanding all the obscurity of motives and differences of character, the frailties and maladies of the soul are known to the Christian divine. Sin he knows in all of its forms; and for remedies, he has the boundless store provided by the Great Master Physician and applied through repentance, faith and obedience, energized by the life-

giving Spirit of God. As a teacher, he ranks among the first educators of the world.

All wisdom and knowledge are included in that truth, which it is his vocation to impart. All human learning contributes to his great purpose.

Above most men, the teacher best knows the joys of imparting instruction; but the Christian teacher has the supreme joy of imparting eternal truths to men, of teaching the living word, which is able to make men wise unto salvation.

Wherein then lie the superior intellectual compensations of any other profession? For the joy of doing the work of the ministry, men have been content to live in deserts; to meditate in the dimness of mountain caves and beneath the pathetic loneliness of silent skies in order to catch the message of divine truth and peace and then come and pour it forth out of their impassioned hearts in strains of eloquence and warning. Such joy, such gladness, such encouragements belong to the minister's weary, unlauded, intellectual toil amid all the rush and intensity and material compensation of the busy, teeming life with which he is surrounded in the city.

The pulpit is the minister's throne. He deals with thoughts about which men are thinking. His soul kindles with rapture as he deals with truths that are heaven-born. He is conscious of divine assistance as he speaks of him, "who has raised up empires from their foundations, turned the stream of history from its old channel, and still continues to rule and guide the ages." In the solemnity of the occasion, in the earnest interest manifest, in the importance of the theme, in the joy that sees men made free, the minister, in the victories of the pulpit, has a coronation of encouragement, that throws a halo of joy upon all his trials and disappointments.

The pleasure and importance of the minister's work in the study and in the pulpit may be freely acknowledged but weakness or neglect in other departments would surely invite defeat. So much depends on the man himself that those who are efficient in tact and happy in personal endowments far outstrip the

intellectual giant or the pulpit orator. You cannot separate the sermon from the sermon-maker.

It is the man back of the sermon, more than any mental force or rhetorical finish or eloquent delivery that gives to the message its power over the listener. Many a preacher fails of success, not through any lack of intellect or oratory, but through lack of those elements of personal character, which are to the message what the powder is to the ball.

The field, therefore, has its defeats and victories no less renowned than the study and the pulpit. To perform the duties of the pastor, to meet successfully the unnumbered cases, problems and annoyances, that arise in his daily dealings with all classes of men and women, requires all the shrewdness of the lawyer, the trained skill of the physician, the tactics and authority of the general and the piety and patience of a saint. Knowing by intuition, when a certain person is going to be sick, aiding poor people in such a way as not to humiliate them, inculcating noble principles in families void of responsibilities, acting as a peacemaker between ill-mated husbands and wives, drumming up patrons for the Sunday school and Church among children and careless, cold-hearted people, in all so acting as to bring men and women to Christ,—in short the work of the pastor alone is sufficiently large and important to employ all his waking hours and engage all his energy and wisdom.

And then in addition he must do the work of the general in getting his little church army so disciplined and suitably fed and supplied that they will convert his preaching into work and enable him to lead them in the assault upon the world. The terrific burden of the world's evangelization has been so trapped upon the shoulders of the clergy that it is almost impossible to get a sufficient number of men-workers to do anything, except to amble along admiringly by your side without getting enough exercise to keep their legs limber or their blood in good circulation. The work lying at the door of the city church can never be done by the ministers alone aided by a few faithful women; we need men-workers. The Church is the parish of the minister and the world is the parish of the Church, and the minis-

trations of the minister in his parish will avail according to the fidelity of the Church in its parish. "If the fires of persecution were kindled again, as they were in the early centuries, there would no doubt be many Luthers and Cranmers and Husses, Peters, Pauls and Stephens; but some, it is to be feared, would hide their lights under a bushel rather than make light by their quivering burning flesh."

In view of the enemies, that are not imaginary but actual and terribly real, that are to be overcome, the city minister sees the necessity of obedience to the divine injunction: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

The city minister lives on the battlefield. He is never beyond the roar of clashing arms and the groans of the suffering and dying.

The city is the heart of the land—it is the fountain of life or death. It is the Gettysburg or the Waterloo of the world's conflict. "If the Lord keep not the city," the day is lost, the dye is cast, the doom is sealed.

What goes on in the city gives color and tone to the actions and pursuits of men. The intense business activity that drives men like beasts of burden every working day of the week makes them too tired to spend the Sabbath day in the Sanctuary, and the worldly greed that blinds men to all, except to what adds to wealth and pleasure, destroys all appetite for spiritual thinking.

The group of abominations which I can only enumerate—Sabbath desecration, the Sunday newspaper, the saloon, the brothel, the low theatre, the gambling dens, sweep away thousands, who never enter the church doors.

The classics tell us of a lake, called Avernus—or birdless—located in the crater of an extinct volcano. From its foul depths exudes a gas, which with infernal power fills the atmos-

phere above and around the lake with a poison so deadly, that any bird, from the kingly eagle to the silver-throated nightingale, attempting to cross it, is stupefied, and notwithstanding its struggle for life, eventually is cast down to the dark waters and engulfed with the thousands, who have gone before into its never satisfied depths of death. Thousands of men, like "these birds of passage" find these abominations of the city to be a lake Avernus, into whose depths they sink, never to rise again.

The great foreign elements,—many of whom are among our noblest and most worthy citizens,—have their headquarters in our cities and in many instances constitute the large majority of our populations. Among these are found the enemies of the American Sabbath, the sworn foes of law and order, and Atheism as daring and defiant and reckless as marked the godless era of the French Revolution.

Romanism, proud, ponderous, impenetrable, unfeeling and towering in its ancient strength and defiant in its clandestine machinations, like an immense deadweight crushes down upon the cities and dictates their government and is the subtle adversary of every effort to ameliorate the conditions of the people and redeem the cities from the hands of corruption and fraud.

Of the corrupt political rings that dominate our cities, a writer whose book is a classic on sociological questions, says: "Who are they? They are gamblers, saloon-keepers, pugilists or worse, who have made a trade of controlling votes and of buying and selling offices, and though they toil not, neither do they spin, they wear the best raiments and spend money lavishly." Organized wrong standing apparently irresistible against unorganized right.

Another great difficulty to be met comes from the very prosperity of the city along with which rises a spirit of discontent among the poor, fostered by the sharp contrasts of the city life and driving them into organizations and labor unions that take the place of the Church. The city by parading its wealth accentuates poverty. Nowhere else is poverty so keenly felt. To the rich man the streets of the city are sympathetic; to the

poor man, their boisterous and arrogant display of wealth awakens the spirit of rebellion.

Phillips Brooks says: "This city poor man is no lay figure for a sermon. He is real. You meet him every day. His is the face that looks moodily at you as you hurry by him on the sidewalk or throw the street's mud from your carriage wheels upon his coat. His is the hand that rings your door-bell in the dusk, and his is the voice that whines and cringes to you in your hall, and curses you as he goes down your steps, with the memory of your glowing wealth before his eyes, and your quiet assurance that you have no money to give him in his ears, and the leaden load of wretchedness heavier than ever, at his heart."

We keep expecting these poor people to throng our churches, we ring our bells, and post our placards, and advertise our services, emblazon our windows, carpet our aisles, put a dash of the opera in our music and a suspicion of the theatre in our preaching, promise them free pews and guarantee no collections; but all that is cheap bait, wherewith to tempt into our churches, one whose hopeless poverty is brought out all the more flagrantly by the ease and comfort of those whom he sees around him, possibly among them those, who on Sunday may know him by name as they welcome him to the church, but during the week, know him only by the number on a block as he goes like a galley-slave to his daily toil.

The difficulty of meeting such people is surpassed only by that of meeting those who make up the other end of the extreme, our very wealthy class, who live in careless luxury and pompous pride.

We laud the devotees of the Salvation Army, who carry the gospel to the people in the slums, and they may be worthy of all the honor bestowed upon them. But it takes a braver man, a more consecrated and a holier man, on a similar mission, to mount the steps of the great brown stone fronts and knock on the massive, carved doors of the haughty, self-satisfied rich man, who, in many instances, is as ignorant of and as antagonistic to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and its great principles of

love to God and man, as the poor black man that courtsies in obeisance at his feet and begs for bread at his kitchen door.

Thus the city minister strikes the waves with his single oar, but apparently scarcely changes so much as a ripple on the boisterous surface of the mighty deep. His loneliness is oppressive. His public services are but a few hours each week; though he be surrounded by hundreds of thousands of his fellows yet

The victims of Avernus seldom come within the limits of his orbit.

The great foreign population are either anti-church or have churches of their own preference.

The Romans are hemmed in, wall upon wall, by prejudice and ignorance.

The hordes of hopeless poor; the proud processions of luxurious wealth—these, constituting almost the entire population of the city, are apparently beyond his reach; many of the remainder have their homes in other churches, so that his constituency, though apparently a city full, are actually but a few hundred; and of these many are attracted by taller steeples and more eloquent preachers so that the size of his audiences is often surpassed by that of those in the smallest country village.

When one undertakes to summarize the discouragements of the city pastor, he is in danger of making himself liable to the charge of pessimism, and of having his sense of responsibilities blunted by the multiplicity of problems and perils with which he is confronted.

"The ocean is very great and our boats are very small,
Why set out to sea at all?"

When he thinks of all the evils and opposing forces, of the many problems, with the solution of which he has to do, he is liable to be overcome with the impression: "And I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away," and to forget that there are "seven thousand in Israel, who have not bowed the knee to Baal."

The minister, however, is not alone. He is in a goodly company.

"Where sin doth abound, grace doth much more abound."

His gentle smile upon the child, his friendly talk with the young man on the street, his earnest conversation with the man in the office, his appeal to the unsaved, these are spoken of in the homes of the rich and the poor alike, with gratitude as rays of sunshine, coming through the rift of the clouds of everyday life. The ties formed at christening, the friendships linked at marriage-feasts, the sympathy expressed in the sick chamber, the comfort in the hour of affliction, the councils given at communion seasons, are generally seeds sown in good and honest hearts, that bring forth fruits of affection and love that shall be a joy forever.

His contact with the brightest and most active minds gives him a keen desire for greater efficiency. Opportunities for doing good meet him wherever he goes and the stirring activities with which he is surrounded catch him in the whirl and inspire him to greater diligence as a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. In his congregations are more intelligent men and women so that even if the average intelligence is no higher than usual, he feels the spur of efforts in his pulpit ministrations. The great work to be done is so commanding and conspicuous, that men more easily recognize their responsibilities and come more quickly to his aid and thus greater things are undertaken for the Master, and money flows freely into the channels of righteousness. Earnest consecration* is never more beautiful than that found in the cities.

The many refining, educational, charitable, moral and religious organizations help to manufacture and sustain the unseen, untrumpeted, but resistless moral force in the city, that more than any laws, more than any penalties, more than any police force, stands like an angel of power hovering over the city, before which the demons of humanity stand in fear.

So that though the city minister sees many discouragements, and his head is often bowed in sorrow, and his heart saddened by the careless indifference of those whom he loves, and his message is spurned by the maddening crowds that rush by him, yet the good soldier most delights to be in the front line, in the thickest of the fight, that shall settle the destiny of nations,

So the city minister rejoices in the privilege of having a place, however lowly, in the very storm-centre of modern civilization, where the battle of the age is being fought to the finish. *It is grand to be at the post of danger.* A brave, hopeful, consecrated, courageous, faithful man, counts it all joy to stand in the place of greatest responsibility.

But the most inspiring encouragement, the supreme joy, the crowning hope of the minister anywhere lies in that department of his work, into which the limits of this subject do not require me to enter.

Our hope is in God, and in his gospel of Jesus Christ, and in his precious promises to all those, who are faithful and valiant in his service; and who, in the making of the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of our Lord, "has chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of aliens."

Professor Tyndal says: "I have seen wild stone avalanches of the Alps which smoke and thunder down declivities sufficient to stun the beholder; yet, to produce enough snow-flakes for a child to carry, has required an energy competent to lift up these shattered blocks and pitch them to twice the height from which they fell." This power is ours, as well as the source of all our glorious history.

It enabled twelve men, with no equipments save the gospel, with no arms and no armies, no royal aid and no learning, no wealth, no power of any kind, as men count power, to fling themselves as an infant of days against all opposition until heathenism, Judaism and imperial Rome fell before its victorious march.

This power still energizes the words of the humblest man of

God and can overturn all opposition and accomplish marvels, at which earth's proud hordes shall stand in awe.

Witness the almost unknown monk, and see how out of his words were brought modern civilization and all its blessings.

Go yonder to Erfurt,—enter the cloister of its monastery,—where Luther is pouring over the word of God.

Afflicted and sad, he has written the walls over with verses—some desponding, some hopeful. A pious old monk, whose own heart has had such trials, whispers to him: "The just shall live by faith." As he looks at the promise, God sets his soul free.

His sickness vanishes; and his soul rises to joy, and he goes forth a strong man to battle with the monster, sin. And in his battling, he writes down his view of his faith. Luther dies. 200 years pass. Go to London. Up that little street, so narrow that a wagon can hardly pass, in a little room there is a company of praying men and women, unknown to fame; an Oxford collegian, who has been to America to preach the gospel, comes into the midst of them and sits down. One of them takes up the commentaries of Luther and reads the preface to Romans; that young collegian follows the reading, and, as he is listening, he says: "My heart was strangely warmed; I too felt that Christ loved even me;" and Wesley went forth and gathered such men as Whitefield and Asbury and men whose names have become historic, to preach the gospel in two continents, and the children of Luther and the children of Wesley have sung that gospel around the world and lifted its light upon the dark places of all nations.

Thousands of others have been blessed by these writings of Luther; and thousands have felt the impress of the burning thoughts that cluster around the great passage, "The just shall live by faith."

What did all this? It was the power of God, turning into eternal fruition the words of the lowly and almost unknown monk. It was the very same power they had at Pentecost,—the source of all our hope and without which our labors are vain.

ARTICLE VI.

ASCETICISM : ITS PLACE IN CHRISTIAN CONDUCT.

BY REV. G. U. WENNER, D. D.

The subject is not antiquated. It is related to the Christian life of every age ; to that of the Twentieth Century as truly as to that of the Middle Ages. It has first of all a personal interest, as a means of sanctification and a help to the holy life. The busy age in which we live is not congenial to its demands. We have much to do. But this great work which we have to do, in which we glory, or under which we groan, as the case may be, may itself become a temptation of Satan. Of what use are all his promised kingdoms if that one little realm, our own heart is an unknown territory, or is not in all its provinces subject to the King ?

The word is older than Christianity. Originally used for the training which athletes had to undergo, it came to be applied by the Stoics to the gymnastics of the soul. Through them it came into Christian thought and practice in the early ages. For many centuries it held undisputed sway over the conscience, and it is still an element that has to be reckoned with by Christian teachers, Romish, Protestant and Episcopalian.

From the purely ethical standpoint asceticism consists in the performance of such acts and the observance of such rules as will lead to moral perfection. Moral perfection is the goal to be reached. Ascetic acts are the means by which men are fitted and strengthened to attain the goal. In classic usage gymnastic and agonistic are used as synonyms of ascetic.

As applied to the religious life acts of asceticism may be divided into two classes, the sensuous and the spiritual, or the somatic and the psychic, the negative and the positive. To the first class belong the forms which proceed from the sensuous life, acts of mortification and self-denial. To the second class belong acts in which the spiritual life takes the initiative and

operates constructively and positively on ourselves and on the world around us, with reference to the upbuilding of the kingdom of God. To this class belong acts of worship, the practice of industry, patience, humility, and so forth.

In the earliest ages of Christianity, down to the beginning of the 4th century, ascetic prescriptions, such as related to fasting and the hours of prayer were observed in fullest harmony with the freedom of the gospel. "Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving," were marks of heretical sects whose views derived their inspiration from heathenism. The Christian principle was: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

From the 4th to the 7th centuries we find a remarkable development of nearly all the chief forms of asceticism, both of the positive or psychical kind, such as observance of hours of prayer, reading the Bible, taking the sacrament, works of charity and the like, as also of the negative or somatic kind such as the infliction of pain upon the body. St. Simeon of the pillar, who died in 460, belongs to the beginning of this period. You remember Tennyson's description:

But yet

Bethink thee, Lord, while thou and all the saints
Enjoy themselves in heaven, and men on earth
House in the shade of comfortable roofs,
Sit with their wives by fires, eat wholesome food,
And wear warm clothes, and even beasts have stalls,
I, 'tween the spring and downfall of the light,
Bow down one thousand and two hundred times,
To Christ, the Virgin Mother, and the Saints;
Or in the night, after a little sleep,
I wake: the chill stars sparkle; I am wet
With drenching dews, or stiff with crackling frost.
I wear an undressed goat-skin on my back;
A grazing iron collar grinds my neck;
And in my weak, lean arms I lift the cross,
And strive and wrestle with thee till I die.

The Middle Ages, from the seventh to the sixteenth century,

from Gregory the Great to Martin Luther, include the thousand years in which the Roman Church held and trained the Germanic races under the sceptre of the popes. Protest as we may against many of their methods, it cannot be denied that they worked-over immense masses of people into some semblance of Christianity. And one of the most potent factors in this process was asceticism. The masses were impressed with the nature of sin and the necessity of penitence, and by their acts of penance were brought into relations of obedience to the demands of the Church.

Among the most remarkable forms of asceticism was that of self-flagellation. For centuries it held sway. Processions of penitents went from city to city in all of Western Europe and sang their doleful Kyries while inflicting upon themselves cruel tortures. It included among its votaries a king of France and an emperor of Germany, and there is no more pathetic story than that of the sufferings of Elizabeth of Hungary at the hands of Conrad of Marburg.

Henry Suso is a representative of the poet mystics of the Middle Ages. He was born in 1295. With a passionate longing to suffer with Christ the pains of the cross, he in his eighteenth year made for himself a wooden cross in length and breadth fitted to his body. Into this cross he drove thirty nails, and day and night he carried it upon his back for eight years. Then he inserted seven sharp needles which pierced his flesh. The pain was so great that he dulled the points of the needles somewhat, but afterwards, ashamed of his unmanly cowardice, he sharpened them again so that the slightest movement inflicted on him sharp pain and the blood flowed. To make the burden more tolerable he carved on the back of the cross the name of Jesus. Every day he engaged in two exercises, which consisted in his pounding on the cross in such a way that the nails pierced his flesh and could only be withdrawn with his garments. This he did secretly and unobserved. The first exercise took place at the pillar of flagellation and there he prayed that Christ might with his wounds heal his own. The second exercise took place at the foot of the cross of Christ and there

he prayed that he might be nailed to Christ and might never be separated from him. On special days he engaged in three exercises, and once having inadvertently touched the hands of two girls who sat near him in church, he underwent thirty exercises. Besides this he engaged in self-flagellation, carried an iron chair, and wore an undergarment furnished with 150 sharp brass nails that constantly tore his flesh. On his breast he carved the letters IHS and renewed them from time to time. These and many other modes of self-torture he endured for 22 years, from his eighteenth to his fortieth year, when for conscientious reasons he ceased the further infliction of torture. And yet at the end of this time, and during the entire period, his soul was filled with the sweetness of divine grace and his writings abound with the testimony of his close fellowship with God. Five hundred years later these writings were published, and one cannot avoid the feeling that, distorted as was the thought of Suso, the Lord himself recognized the service rendered in an age of barbarous sensuality as a testimony to that statement of St. Paul which is fundamentally true in all the ages: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

We come to review its place in the history of Protestant churches. Luther, with his ideas of justification by faith and of the freedom of the Christian man, had little use for asceticism in his doctrinal system, although personally he practiced many of its principles. He was known to spend three hours a day in prayer. And in his catechism he says; "fasting and the preparation of the body are indeed a good external discipline but he is truly worthy and well prepared (to receive the Lord's Supper) who believes these words given and shed for you for the remission of sins." But it was through Melancthon, the pedagogue, the Preceptor of Germany, that the ascetic ideas found a place in the symbols. They are placed under the *Tertius Usus* of the law, the law as a school-master.

The Reformed trend of Protestantism retained several ascetic features. The Episcopal type recommends at certain intervals seasons of what the Lutherans called discriminations in foods,

and it has also had a great influence in the social observance of what is popularly called Lent. This season in society, which formerly consisted of forty days, a theatrical manager recently declared has now been reduced to two, Ash Wednesday and Good Friday. The Puritans have given as their contribution to the ascetic life of Protestantism, the observance of the Lord's Day as a Sabbath, and the establishment of Fast Day. But if a recent proclamation of a New Hampshire governor is to be believed, the fast has become a feast. The Reformed Presbyterians prescribe fasting as a *sine qua non* for the Lord's Supper.

Among Protestants, the nearest approach to the ascetic life has been made by the Methodist society. The very name points to the thing. The members of their churches are forbidden to dance, to play cards to attend the circus or the theater. Those who do these things, it is ordered by their discipline shall be expelled if after due admonition there be no sign of real humiliation.

The sections of the Methodist discipline relating to ministers prescribe questions of the most searching kind in relation to their daily conduct :

"Do you use as much fasting and abstinence every week as your health, strength and labor will permit? Do you deny yourself every useless pleasure of sense? Do you use only that kind and degree of food which is best both for body and soul? Do you eat no more at each meal than is necessary? Do you choose and use water for your common drink? Wherein do you take up your cross daily?

There are also some restrictions in the matter of smoking.

It will thus be seen that so far as negative or somatic asceticism is concerned the Methodist rules are a close copy of the principles of monastic regulations. And in regard to spiritual exercises the rules are equally strict. There must be set times for rising, reading the Bible, meditation and prayer. There are rules in regard to conversation and social relations in general. Many of these things we could not approve. They appear somewhat legalistic. Certainly to an ease-loving generation they must frequently prove irksome. But does it not seem

that God has greatly blessed the people who so resolutely took up their cross of self-denial? A recent encyclical of their bishops calls attention to some of the needs of their church. If there has been a loss of world-conquering power among Methodists, may it not be owing to some extent at least to the relaxation of the discipline which characterized the epigons of their church.

The ascetic trend of the Methodist church is seen also in the name which they give to their religious services. They call them "exercises," *exercitia spiritualia*, that is drill, or spiritual gymnastics. The term is now so commonly used that one needs to be reminded of its etymology to appreciate its real significance.

To the Methodists also we are indebted for the practice of kneeling in prayer. The Lutherans, in harmony with the early church, prescribe standing, excepting in acts of penitence, while the Reformed churches repudiate all attitudinarianism in devotional acts.

It thus appears that apart from certain schools or tendencies there are few traces of asceticism in Protestant church-life. In the Christian Endeavor Society we have a revival of the vow or pledge, and the members of the Tenth Legion devote a definite portion of their income to the purposes of religion. At a recent Northfield meeting an inquisition was attempted in regard to the length of time which the ministers spent in prayer but the effort threw a coldness over the meeting. Occasionally spasmodic efforts are made to imitate Episcopalian practices. But it must be evident to even a superficial observer that asceticism as a principle has but a slight hold on the Protestant conscience and that its import is either not known, or else is intelligently repudiated.

In other words, the performance of outward acts and the observance of arbitrary rules for the purpose of self-discipline and the attainment of a higher life take but a small place in our pastoral theology.

Nevertheless in view of the prominent place which this subject has held in the history of the Church and its constant re-

currence to the consciences of men we must be ready to give an answer to the question: Has asceticism a place in Christian conduct?

The answer is found in the very nature of man. Our old nature does not leave us in the moment of regeneration. Like Sinbad the Sailor's old man of the sea, the old Adam has flung his legs around us with tenacious grip. The Christian life is a conflict between the old man and the new. Regeneration is not sanctification. The *sarx* has not yet been destroyed. The regenerate man has indeed a new spirit which delights in the law of God. But the law in the members promptly takes up the challenge which is thrown down nor will it ever lose its vitality so long as we run in the race of this earthly life.

Hence this psycho-somatic nature of ours has to be kept in check, and as St. Paul directs, we must pummel it and lead it along like a slave.

This has nothing to do with that Pharisaic spirit which beholds in the performance of outward acts an offering acceptable to God, and which has held so many, and not merely those of the Middle Ages, in spiritual bondage. Every creature of God is good, and as Luther says, in reference to acts of self-mortification: "God is not a murderer like the devil, whose object is to make the salvation-by-works people fast and pray and vigilate themselves to death." But it does imply a recognition of the fact that in the new covenant as in the old, in the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world as well as in their personal relation to that kingdom the people of God are called to engage in a holy war. "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince has thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed."

Because a Christian is never a result but always a process, as Luther says, it is incumbent upon him to watch and struggle continually against the powers of evil that surround him. There is no swifter or more well-trodden way to spiritual death than simply to let things drive, to live an easy life without subjecting one's self to the discipline and restraint of the order to which we belong.

The practice of ascetic acts, is, it is true largely a personal question, one that every one must decide for himself. And we may admit with Rothe that the less a man needs them, the better he is off. Still, the practice of daily self-examination and particularly prior to the reception of the Lord's Supper would be wholesome. So too the stated reading of Scriptures, the use of manuals of devotion, the imposition of *silentium* upon a tongue that wags too freely, the confession of faults to some Christian friend, or to some father or mother confessor might help to restore to normal strength many a flabby Christian.

In the Protestant system acts of asceticism are to be used for a certain purpose, as means, and when they are no longer needed they may be omitted. They have no absolute value in themselves. Acts of faith only have a moral value, as Schleiermacher has well said.

But the question has a much wider reach. It stretches into the entire view of life, and it is not saying too much that it includes the fundamental conception of our duty to God and our relation to the world. It is the question whether Christian conduct in its deepest impulses means a renunciation of the world or merely a subjugation of the world. I do not mean the world in the narrow sense, in which it is declared to be not a friend of God, but the world in a wider sense, this present life with all that it contains and offers, as contrasted with the kingdom of God both in its heavenly and earthly manifestations. Should we sing "I'm a pilgrim and I'm a stranger," and should we keep our eyes fixed on the heavenly Jerusalem, or should we live in the world and for the world as for something that is itself destined to be the kingdom of God. Rothe was the great apostle of this latter doctrine and he has been followed to a great extent by the liberal theologians of our day.

Kaftan it is true concedes that Christianity has a mystic side *renouncing* the world, as well as an ethical side which *embraces* the world. But Ritschl declares that renunciation of the world is allowable only in so far as it is necessary to overcome the world. It is peculiar to Protestantism, he says in his history of Pietism, to regard Christianity not as a fleeing from the world

but as filling and permeating the world. As opposed to the pietistic and monastic spirit, he regards Christian perfection as consisting in the fulfilment of ones calling. According to Hermann a Christian finds eternal good right here in the midst of this present life and not outside of it. We are dead to the world when we make a proper use of it, that is when we control it. But captivating as these words are, and calculated to win the applause of all who like Demas have loved this present world, and recognizing too that they give the key-note to much of the pulpit utterance of modern times, they do not represent the confession of the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints. Rather would I live in the atmosphere of a Kempis a Tersteegen and a Wesley, than to breathe the balmiest airs of this earthly Paradise. They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. They are *in* the world but they are not *of* it. The center of their being is not on earth but in heaven.

The Son of God goes forth to war,

A kingly crown to gain;

His blood-red banner streams afar,

Who follows in his train?

Who best can drink his cup of woe, triumphant over pain;

Who patient bears his cross below, he follows in his train.

A noble army—men and boys, the matron and the maid;

Around the Saviour's throne rejoice, in robes of light
arrayed

They climbed the steep ascent of heaven through peril, toil
and pain:

Oh God, to us may grace be given to follow in their train.

ARTICLE VII.

JESUS WITH THE DOCTORS.

LUKE 9 : 41-52.

BY REV. R. B. PEERY, PH. D.

Wonderful are the silences of Scripture. If many things revealed to us in God's holy word are strange, some things that are not revealed are hardly less strange. Doubtless we have all been impressed, in reading our Bibles, by the things that are passed over in silence. As we read about certain incidents we feel that something we have long desired to know may now be made plain to us ; but when we approach the crucial point our curiosity is not gratified—the *inspired* penman has left unwritten what we hoped to find there. Alexander Maclaren has said that these silences of Scripture are as eloquent as its speech.

Recall some examples of these strange silences. We read in 2 Cor. 12 : 2-4 that St. Paul was caught up even to the third heaven, into Paradise, and that he there heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Have we not often wondered what those unspeakable words were?

Again, in John 8 : 3-8 we read that when the Pharisees brought the woman taken in adultery to Jesus and accused her before him he stooped down and wrote with his finger in the sand. Then raising his tender eyes, he gave permission for those who were without sin among them to cast the first stone at her—for according to Moses' law such a woman should be stoned to death. Again stooping down he continued writing in the sand. What words did our Master write? This is the only time the Scriptures speak of Jesus as having written anything, and the words he wrote are not recorded in the Book.

When our blessed Lord was crucified between two thieves we know that one of them, repenting of his sins, turned to Jesus in that last dark hour, and prayed, "Lord, remember me when

thou comest in thy kingdom." And Jesus forgetting his pain, replied graciously, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Paradise! That home of the departed soul! The place where the spirits of our sainted dead are gone! What is it? Is it the final heaven? or is it a resting place this side of the goal? Oh that Jesus had on this occasion uttered just a few words about that Paradise to which we are all swiftly going! But the sacred lips were closed, and the knowledge is sealed to us this side of the grave.

The last verse of the last chapter of John is a wonderful verse. After recording all the strange sweet things that Jesus said and did during his remarkable life, the beloved disciple tells us, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." What were some of these "other things"? We can never know.

But most wonderful of all the wonderful silences of Scripture is that about the childhood and young manhood of Jesus. We are told about his miraculous conception, about the birth in Bethlehem, the visit of the wise men, the presentation in the temple, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth; and then a curtain falls over the life of the Christ-child, effectually hiding him from our view.

The loving heart naturally inquires about that early life in Nazareth. We would like to know something of his home life, who were his playmates, what games he played, who were his teachers. But God has hidden all these things from us, and for good reason. Our judgment as to the relative value of things is so often in error; we are so apt to let that which is near and intelligible to us occupy our minds to the exclusion of things that are farther away and more difficult of comprehension, no matter how important they may be. If we know of the daily life of the child Jesus we would pay too much attention to it. Do we not see in the apocryphal books of the Bible to what extremes this tendency of our nature leads men? The first thirty years of Jesus' life were but preparatory—his work was to

come after. By passing over these thirty years in silence the inspired apostles would direct our minds exclusively to that which is all-important in him. It is well that we do not know the details of the early life of our Lord.

But the curtain which conceals from our curious view that sacred home was once drawn aside, and we see Jesus at twelve years of age going up with Joseph and Mary to the Paschal Feast at Jerusalem. How thankful we are for this one incident! It throws a bright light upon the whole period, and by it the imagination is able to reconstruct in large part the child-life of Jesus:

I have sat in my room on the hillside in Nagasaki on a dark night, and looked out upon the city and harbor, when the beautiful hills were wrapped in thick darkness, and nothing was visible but the myriad lights in the city and on the shipping in the harbor. Suddenly there flashed out from one of those mighty men-of-war a powerful search-light, which threw its brilliant rays far into the dark hills and made them light as day. In an instant it was gone, and all was shrouded in black darkness again. This visit of Jesus to Jerusalem at twelve years of age is a search-light, giving us a momentary glimpse of his whole early life.

We will look closely into this first conscious visit of Jesus to Jerusalem.

The men of Judea and Galilee were required to go up to Jerusalem three times per year, to attend the three great feasts. Women were not compelled to go; neither was it customary for them to do so. From the fact that Mary was wont to accompany her husband to the feasts we would infer that she was a deeply religious woman, to whose devout soul those sacred ceremonies afforded great comfort and satisfaction. Children were thought to reach a period of accountability at twelve years of age, and were required to present themselves in Jerusalem at that time. They then became "children of the law," and had a personal responsibility in connection with the national religion. In compliance with this requirement, the little lad Jesus now

went up with his mother and Joseph to Jerusalem for the first time.

Let us try to picture the procession. It is the joyous spring-timē. Many men and some women and children are going up to the nation's capital. All work is laid aside, and mirth and rejoicing prevail. The pilgrims are dressed in their best robes, and are full of glad anticipation of the coming feast. And so they set out by foot on the long journey of sixty or seventy miles to Jerusalem. The men would naturally drift together; the women would form little companies of their own; and the happy children would play in bands by the way. And thus, laughing and shouting, and especially singing those grand old "songs of ascent" they slowly wended their way over high hill and verdant vale towards the sacred city.

What were the emotions of Jesus on this, his first conscious visit to Jerusalem? His childhood had been spent among the quiet pastoral scenes of Galilee, and in the little hamlet of Nazareth. Now he was going to see for the first time a great city. My childhood and youth were spent in a quiet country home, and I never saw a large town until I was almost a young man. Well do I remember the day when at sixteen years of age my father took me with him to Baltimore, and I had my first sight of a large city, with its countless houses and thronging multitudes. Is it irreverent to suppose that some such feeling filled the breast of the lad Jesus, as he made his first visit to a large city?

But this journey meant far more than that to him. He was going up to the city of his fathers, the center of the religious associations and memories of the Jewish race. We know from his later life that he was thoroughly conversant with Jewish history. He knew all the wonderful events that had occurred in this city of David and Solomon. He knew all the hallowed associations that clustered around that sacred spot. And I think these thoughts must have been uppermost in his mind as he drew near to Jerusalem on that bright spring morning. Doubtless in glad anticipation he repeated oft on this journey the Psalmist's words: "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us

go into the house of the Lord; our feet shall stand within thy gates, Oh Jerusalem." Perhaps as he came to the summit of Olivet and caught his first glimpse of the magnificent city his heart involuntarily exclaimed: "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion."

And what must his feelings have been as he entered the great city, and began the ascent of Mount Moriah! Raising his eyes, he would see on the summit the splendid temple, a mountain of marble and gold, glittering in the sunlight. The temple had been rebuilt on a grand scale by Herod. So large were its proportions that 200,000 people could find standing room in it at one time. The slabs of marble that made its walls were of enormous size; while the ornamentation of gold and silver was beautiful beyond comparison. But more than its outward beauty was the inner meaning of the temple to Jesus. To him it was the local center of the religion of Jehovah; the place where the presence of God dwelt; where had hovered the cherubin and seraphim; and where had burned the sacred fire on the altar. His heart overflowing with these emotions, he went in with his earthly parents to do after the manner of the feast.

The sacrifices, the gorgeous ritual, the brilliant robes, the grave, gray-bearded priests, must have made a deep impression upon his youthful mind. We know not when the consciousness of his Messiahship first dawned in the mind of Jesus. There are many who think that he was aware of his great mission from early childhood; while there are others who think that this consciousness did not come until the time of his baptism by John in the Jordan. But it seems highly probable that here in the holy temple this great idea first dawned in the mind of our Saviour. His childhood had doubtless been quiet and uneventful; and there had perhaps been little to call forth latent ideas and powers. But now he was in the sacred temple; its hallowed memories were crowding on his mind; its brilliant ceremonies were before his eyes. May it not well have been that as a natural rebound to all these influences there sprang up in his consciousness the idea that he himself was the one whom all this typified, the long-looked-for Messiah?

When Joseph and Mary had fulfilled the days they started on the homeward journey, and the boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem. Although the feast lasted seven days, pilgrims from the provinces were permitted to return at the end of the second day, and it is most likely that Joseph and Mary returned at that time. The doctors would hardly have been accessible to Jesus after the seven days were past. It was quite natural that the parents of Jesus should leave the city without enquiring if he was with them, for he was a big boy now, and had always shown himself worthy of their trust and confidence. They supposed that he was somewhere in their company. Jesus himself was absorbed by the contemplation of the things of the temple, and without any thought of disrespect had remained behind "in his Father's house." Perhaps he was not even aware that his mother had gone.

It was customary on these feast days for some of the scribes to go out in the porch of the temple, and instruct the people in the law by familiar conversation with question and answer. To one of these little parties Jesus drew near, and listened with rapt attention. By and by he took part in the discussion, and "they were amazed at his understanding and answers." There is nothing in the account to justify us in thinking that Jesus assumed the role of teacher; he was simply there as a reverent and dutiful scholar, answering their questions and asking them questions in return.

It would be most natural for the scribes on these occasions to talk to the people about the institution of the Passover, and how God had brought their fathers out of Egypt with a mighty hand; and perhaps Jesus by his questions led them to speak of the deep inner meaning of the Passover, and the Lamb of God therein typified, who should be slain for the sins of the world. Let us turn our thoughts again to Joseph and Mary. After going a day's journey they made enquiry for Jesus among their kinsfolk and acquaintances. As they continued to seek for him and found him not they must have grown very anxious about him, and I think that his mother slept little that night. A child of twelve alone in Jerusalem! and in such a crowd! When the

long night had passed and morning finally dawned they started back to the city, seeking for Jesus. Their first day's journey had not been a long one. Fatigued by the observance of the feast, and the pressing crowd, it was usual to travel only about eight miles on the first day of the homeward journey. So Joseph and Mary soon reached Jerusalem again, and began their search. Perhaps they first looked for the lost boy where the children were accustomed to gather for play, or where some strange sight was to be seen—but in no such place as that were they to find him. At last, after three days of anxiety and fears, they found him where they should have sought him in the beginning—in the holy temple. When they went in, there he was, "sitting in the midst of the doctors."

They were amazed at the sight. Here was their meek and retiring child, holding familiar converse with the most grave and learned doctors of the law. And they were listening to him with respect, and close attention. There were giants in Jerusalem in those days. The learned Hillel and Gamaliel were at the height of their influence and reputation; and one or both of them may have been in the company with Jesus. Joseph seems to have been speechless with astonishment; but the mother-heart of Mary at once broke through all bounds, and rushing forward she cried out, "Son, why has thou thus dealt with us? Behold thy father and I sought thee sorrowing." These are words of love; but they are words of gentle reprimand also. Doubtless this was the first time Mary had ever felt it necessary to reprimand her son.

To her question Jesus replied, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" It was as though he had said, "It was not necessary that ye seek me; if ye wanted me ye might have known where to find me—in my Father's house." Jesus heart was so full of holy emotion; the new idea of his peculiar relation to the Father so absorbed his mind that it may have seemed to him his mother should be aware of it too.

Note the words of Jesus here. They are the first recorded words of our Lord, and as such have peculiar interest for us.

Those blessed lips, which afterwards spoke such words of sweetness and comfort to a discouraged world, now open for the first time, and their message is about the Father. The last words of him while in the flesh, too, were about the Father, and this was Jesus' message to the world—*The Fatherhood of God*.

We read that when Jesus replied thus to his parents "they understood not the saying which he spake unto them." We are not surprised that Joseph did not know what these words meant; but it does seem that Mary should have known something of their meaning. Is it possible that she had forgotten the wonderful announcement of the angel that he was to be great, and should be called the Son of the Highest? Had she forgotten the worship of the wise men? the song of old Simeon at the presentation in the temple? and the miraculous preservation of the young life from the wrath of Herod? Not entirely. But twelve long years had passed since these marvellous events had happened; doubtless there had been nothing else unusual about the little boy's life during all these years; and so Mary's eye had been dimmed by time, and her memory dulled by the commonplace things of life. She did not realize that her child was to be the Saviour of the world.

It would not have been well for Mary to have had a full realization of the dignity and exaltedness of her divine Son from his childhood. If she had known that the little babe who nursed her bosom, slept so sweetly in her arms, or kneeled in evening prayer at her knee, was very God, for whose coming the world waited, how could she have given him proper human training? God, who directed Christ's early life and ours, has done all things well.

But if Joseph and Mary did not know, Jesus now knew who he was. God was his Father, in an especial and peculiar sense. He had a mission to perform different from that of all other men on earth. And so he must be "about the things of his Father."

But, although this was his Father's house, and he was engaged in his Father's business, his time had not yet fully come.

Therefore he dutifully went down with them to Nazareth, and was subject unto them. To him it was indeed a *going down*, both literally and figuratively: down from the proud capital to the despised province; down from the gorgeous temple to the little synagogue; down from his Heavenly Father's house to the humble home of his mother. I think Jesus would fain have tarried in the temple at Jerusalem; but he was still a child, subject to his earthly parents, and present duty required that he return with them. So he went back to obscure Nazareth, and was obedient to them in all things. There he increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.

And here the curtain again falls and hides him from our view for eighteen long years, until at last his merciful mission began with his baptism in the Jordan. Since then no curtain and no power can hide him from the adoring view of loyal, loving hearts.

This tender incident has its lessons. Christ by his own conduct has set before all children an inspiring example of filial love. By his own subjection he would teach little boys and girls to be dutiful and obedient, and to remain in subjection to their parents in all things.

We learn here that children are members of God's Church by birthright; and that it is their privilege and duty to claim a share in the holy covenant as soon as they reach years of responsibility. Christ grew up with the idea in his mind that he was already within the kingdom, and with the expectation of publicly claiming his birthright as soon as he reached the required age.

Another profitable lesson for us here is Christ's perfect humanity. We see him in the near relation to his earthly parents; we see him gradually developing physically and spiritually as other men; we see something of the thoughts and emotions that welled up in his sacred heart. He was made in all points like as we are, yet without sin. And by this he is made so much nearer and dearer to us.

Thanks be to God for this beautiful incident in the child-life of our blessed Lord.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY PROF. DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

If we were called to summarize the theological thought of the times, it would be that, according to the letter and spirit of recent theology, the defence of Christianity now has two duties: The first of these duties is to show that anti-Christian views of the world, such as the monistic or pantheistic, are scientifically untenable; while the second is, that modern science shows no results which are contradictory of the Christian faith, or in any true sense a nullification of its doctrines. The great mark of our times, scientific and practical, is the undue stress laid upon this present world and life. "Development" does not explain the problem of being, but only pushes it back, in all probability, some millions of years. The modern spirit tries also to separate ethics from religion. That spirit seeks for an "ethical culture" that is to be dissociated from belief in God. Such ethics however, as has been demonstrated time and again, is like unto a rose separated from its stem, with the possibility of life only so long as a little sap is left in it. Another thing is being made more and more manifest in the theological thinking of the times, that to teach Christianity without miracles is labor in vain and that for a religion dissociated from the supernatural, there is no possible hope of success. Our religion rests upon three kinds of miracles—natural, spiritual and historical, of which the spiritual is the most important. The proof from experience cannot give absolute certainty of the truth of Christianity; neither can the proof be found alone in Bible authority expressed in mechanical views of inspiration, but both experience and biblical au-

thority must be supported by the historic Christ. He must not be the vague and uncertain Christ of the Ritschlians, but the supernatural, the divine and human, the miraculous, crucified and risen Christ, who is revealed in fulness in the New Testament. Blass the eminent philologist, takes the liberal theologians to task, in a recent lecture on "The Scriptures and the Protestant Church." He makes a distinction between a scientific theology which subjects itself to the Bible and one which subjects the Bible to itself. The latter sort of scientific theology, on one ground and another, does not hesitate to dispute the resurrection of Christ, and in so doing declares all the apostles liars and deceivers. Such action, he says, shows an utter lack of scientific criticism. Blass is a layman, and he holds that, for a so-called Christian theologian, to face the apostles and reject their united and uniform testimony is to show unfitness for the work of a Christian teacher.

This it seems to us is the real signification of the theological situation now confronting us. The question of the hour is this: Is a new era in the history—we will not say of Christianity—but of religion about to be inaugurated?

Christianity being a system built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, any entering wedge that will effectually separate the foundation from the corner-stone, the prophets and the apostles from Christ, must also sooner or later bring down in inextricable ruins the whole superstructure, much of the material that has entered into it may at last be gathered out of the debris and wrought into another structure of some sort, but we must not lose sight of the fact that it will be in a distinct sense another structure. Those who are engaged in diligently driving the wedge need not blink their grave responsibility.

The issue must be faced in our day and generation. The question for some teachers of religion is this, are they prepared to assume the roll of the founders of a new and more or less elective and syncretistic species of Christianity? If so, who or what shall be the chief corner-stone and who or what shall constitute the precious foundation?

The issue for others of us is this: Are we prepared to accept this proposed substitute for the foundation, which, from of old, has consisted of the prophets and apostles, and which has Jesus Christ himself as the chief corner-stone? The issue is becoming plainer every day, and the lines of conflict are being drawn with an increasing tension.

New England theology designates a species of Christian thought which was developed in this country between 1730 and 1830. It attracted attention, was brought under discussion, and acquired a fuller and fuller statement from time to time throughout the one hundred years between the periods above noted.

This theological movement was begun without even a surmise of the path to be traversed, or of the result to be reached. The initial purpose seems to have been simply resistance to certain influences which, it was feared, were leading many people astray from the truths of the gospel. One treatise on theology led to another, critiques led to defenses of doctrines for the truth's sake, until finally a large body of theological literature came into existence. Various names were from time to time applied to this system of divinity, it being called in some quarters, with a sort of mild derision, "New Light," "New Divinity" and "Berkshire Divinity." As a scheme of Christian thought New England Theology assumed various phases, one being permanent at one time and another at another time, but there are four which assumed from the names of their chief expounders, special designations, viz., Edwardsianism, Hopkinsianism, Emmonsism and Taylorism. The second and fourth of these were the most marked. Ranked according to their Calvinistic tendencies the older theologians of this school were known as "Old Calvinists," "Moderate Calvinists" and "Consistent Calvinists," or according to the somewhat acrostic classification of the late Professor Edwards A. Park, "Calvinist," "Calvinistic," "Calvinistical" and "Calvinisticalish."

It will thus be seen at a glance that New England Theology has passed through a great variety of phases and has been subject to great fluctuations from time to time. Its latest phase has

been called the "New Theology." The difference between all phases of this latest evolution of New England religious thought and every phase of the older development is marked, and in some of its forms, radical. That a long distance has been covered between the older types and the new is decidedly manifest in a recently published book, by a New England theological teacher, Professor Levi Leonard Paine of the Bangor Congregational Theological Seminary.

The title of Prof. Paine's book, this last and radical interpretation of New England theology is "A Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism, and its Outcome in the New Christology." A competent critic has said somewhat extravagantly, we think, that this is "the most remarkable book issued from the press in the United States during the present year." We think it would be more safely within the limits of moderation to say that of the strictly theological books of the current year thus far, none will compare with it in the matter of its incongruity with the source from which it proceeds, or the startling nature of the conclusions reached by its author.

The title of the book and the position of its author as a teacher of candidates for the ministry in what claims to be an evangelical school, would lead one to expect a calm and judicial contribution to the interesting domain of the history of doctrine. But a man does not need to travel far in Prof. Paine's book until he finds he is dealing not with a judicial contribution to historical theology but with a vehement polemic. In the first half of his treatise the author proposes to trace the growth of the Trinitarian idea from its origins. His first conclusion is the astounding one that the Trinitarian idea has neither beginning roots, nor germs of any kind in the Scriptures. The Old Testament knows nothing but monotheism, and any suspicion or inkling of more than one person in the Godhead would have been a fatal first step towards polytheism, against which the entire drift of Hebrew thinking militates. After thus rapidly sketching this position he goes on to allege further that as far as the New Testament is concerned, the same conclusion may be maintained. He recognizes two kinds of sources behind the New Testament:

first the simple, early and credible sources, like the gospel of Mark and large portions of Matthew and Luke and the whole of John. These arose at a later date and embodied traditions and legends that confused and blurred the real facts of the life and work of Jesus. Of these two claims of sources we are, of course, to take the first one as our basis; and when we do this all idea of a trinity in the Godhead disappears. Neither Jesus nor any of his immediate followers knew anything of this idea. They uniformly represent him as a mere man. The only distinction they claim for him is a superior knowledge and clear consciousness, so to speak, of his direct relation of sonship with God. This consciousness they represent him as trying to impart to others. That is all of his work and all of his teaching. The doctrine of the Trinity thus deprived of all scriptural foundation is then shown to rest upon post-apostolic speculations and misconceptions.

During the ante-Nicene period, according to Prof. Paine's consciousness, certainly not according to the facts, that doctrine reaches a certain stage of development marked by the speculations of Origen and Athanasius. In these writers the doctrine consists of the recognition of a tri-personality in God with the subordination of the Son and Holy Spirit to the Father. Essentially this is tri-theistic. With Augustine a new cycle begins. The Neoplatonic philosophy, which was essentially pantheistic in its principles, is taken as the ground of speculation. All thinking on the subject of the Trinity is thenceforth dominated by this incipient pantheism and reverts back to Sabellius. The history of Trinitarianism since Augustine is nothing but a play of differing shades of Sabellianism. Prof. Paine illustrates this especially by examining New England Trinitarianism. He passes in review the most prominent thinkers of this country from Edwards to Phillips Brooks and Geo. S. Goodson, and charges each of them in turn with holding a form of Sabellianism. In fact the daring author alleges that no further changes are possible nor must any be accepted. The cycle has been run, and the revolving force in this Trinitarian conception has been exhausted.

We have thus endeavored fairly and truthfully to set forth the teaching of this book. It is at the point at which we have arrived that Prof. Paine assumes the roll of a prophet. What next? is the question he endeavors to answer, and his answer is in entire harmony with the principles of his critical history, as we have thus far sketched it.

"It would not be surprising" says our author, "if it should be found that there are some Trinitarians who are 'unconscious' Unitarians." We should certainly think so, but with the added reflection that there can be no unconsciousness about Prof. Paine's location. His judgment is that the old theology has run its course and that it can neither be restored to its former power nor modified by any sort of amendment or compromise and made to serve any good purpose. The only place for it is the place where other ancient things are stored, in the museum of antiquities. What is needed indeed, in fact what must come, is a new theology without any sort of contact with the old, save perhaps the name of Jesus Christ.

But the question arises, what shall this New Theology be? It is at this point that, like all destructive critics of his sort, Prof. Paine leaves us like Mohammed's coffin hanging in perplexing uncertainty and peril, between the heavens and the earth. It is not possible, says he, to outline the New Theology at this present time. The time for reconstruction has not come and cannot in the nature of the case, come until all debris resulting from the crumbling down and destruction of the old has been removed. Nevertheless in Prof. Paine's book we can see some advanced plans of the new structures: 1. The New Theology is to be constructed upon the inductive method, pure and simple. 2. It is to be moulded by the historical, the religious and the rational tendencies of our age. 3. It is to eschew the speculative and metaphysical method altogether. 4. As to its content it is to begin with the idea of God, not as the infinite and absolute spirit, for that would involve metaphysics. God is to be conceived of as a person of vast magnitude, but otherwise just like man. 5. Man is to be conceived of as the last result of the process of evolution. Christ as simply a man; the Bible

a collection of fragments, remnants of a remarkable but not unique literature; the supernatural as impossible and unhistorical; the atonement as a coming of man into the consciousness of his true relation with God.

Such are some of the elements of the new system of New England theology, as we gather them from Prof. Paine's interesting book, the most striking characteristic of which, we hardly need say, is its uncompromising radicalism. Mere radicalism of course, is no sign of truth or falsehood, soundness or unsoundness, but the singular thing about the radicalism of this book is that it is put forth in the interest of historic continuity. Another conspicuous feature of this author's thinking is his attitude toward thinkers of all schools. He moves in the usual atmosphere of assumed superiority and cock-sureness so characteristic of advanced and liberal religious thinkers. He names no other writers as far as we have been able to discern except to criticize and condemn.

The fault which vitiates the whole method of Prof. Paine's thinking is his entire inability to realize the value of the philosophic element in correct scientific method. He seems to be entirely unaware of the fact that when he is declaiming against metaphysics in theology with real iconoclastic fury that he himself is planted upon a metaphysical basis of a very poor sort. He desires to ignore all the innate ideas which lie at the foundation of thinking, but finds much difficulty in so doing. He is inexorable on this subject but very inconsistently so, and has accordingly, as we deem it, made a grotesque as well as a superficial effort at becoming a sort of John the Baptist for a new theology in a country in which there are many rejected and abandoned theological speculations to admonish him against such unwisdom. If appeal be made to the historic sense of which our author makes so much use, his prophecy to which we have already made reference looks as if it were foreordained to disappointment.

II.

GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

In the May number of the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Buettner, of Belgard, Pomerania, discusses "Zinzendorf's Service in Theology." We have long ago forsaken Bengel's adverse judgment as to the work of Herrnhut. Zinzendorf was a pathfinder in mission work, and the organizations scattered throughout the world, which his spirit pervaded, were places where the holy fire was fostered. "There is not a hymn-book in German evangelical Christianity that does not contain hymns by Zinzendorf. They belong to the noblest part of our hymnology, as well as do the hymns of Luther and Gerhardt." He also helped the Lutheran Church toward a proper appreciation of the work of laymen, which the Reformed Church had from the beginning. Although he busied himself with theology, and was recognized by the Teubingen faculty as a "Lutheran theologian," no one regards him in that light now. With the exception of several catechisms he wrote nothing of a scientific character. However, he offers material to the church historian. And in the field of exegesis he made several attempts but accomplished nothing. He was not a learned theorist, but a practical man, a man of life and experience. Yet, nevertheless, his influence can be traced in several very important doctrines.

He made Christ the star and center of all theology. His preaching of the eternal divinity of Christ was as a dam in the stream of the rationalism that denied Christ. It is true that he emphasized the divinity of Christ at the expense of the revelation of God the Father, but he did it in such a way that it did not prevent him from coming to a proper appreciation of Christ's full humanity, which the Lutheran Church up until his time had not taught, and from the standpoint of the *communicatio*

idiomatum, could not teach. And though the Reformed theologians were clear as to Christ's humanity, they placed the two natures together in such a way that the unity of the personality was lost. "No one will expect that Zinzendorf gave a complete and clear solution to those very difficult problems in Christology. He was not the man for that. But he gave fruitful thoughts and hints, which the more recent representatives of the doctrine of Kenosis, each one in his own way laying hold of the ingenious suggestions of Zinzendorf, could deepen and establish scientifically: a problem in Dogmatics, which, in spite of the works of Hofmann, Thomasius, Getz and Frank, is far from a satisfactory solution even at the present time." In spite of certain errors, he has been called "the father of the modern Kenotic Christology."

His teaching in regard to Holy Scripture departs from traditional orthodoxy in a somewhat analogous way. In both he conceived of the human element in a real and more living way. In no other doctrine were the errors of scholasticism so apparent as in the teaching of Lutheran and Reformed dogmatists on this subject. No one dared to judge as liberally in regard to the individual books as did Luther. "Scripture and revelation had been identified for some time." The Holy Ghost was regarded as the author of the bible. "The prophets and the apostles were merely the writers for whom the Holy Spirit dictated revelation to their pens." Quenstedt taught that difference of style was due to accommodation to the personality of the writer on the part of the Holy Spirit. Calovius accounted for it by the nature of the material. Zinzendorf protested against this, reverently but firmly. He taught that the content of the bible was the thoughts of the heart of God, but that in other things it was the same as everything else that was touched by the hand of man. In this he was far in advance of any man of his day. He also appreciated the different degrees of knowledge and life as seen in the Old and New Testaments. And in his estimation of the New Testament he opened the way for those who find differences in the doctrinal conceptions as presented by the different writers.

Zinzendorf's teaching concerning repentance corrected certain errors of his time. "In spite of all Spener's warning, Pietism had departed from the healthful teaching of the Scripture in this doctrine. According to the pietistic conceptions we should not consider anybody converted who had not fought through the *agon poenitentiae* with its various stages. According to this teaching there belonged to true repentance "a mighty inward struggle, lasting a long time, a hard fight with sin and the flesh, and an increasing sadness that almost reached despair. Then by a sudden act of grace on the part of the Spirit the individual was lead out of this into the blessed joy of the children of God. Every converted man must be able to tell the day and the hour when grace triumphed with him." With this idea of repentance in mind Zinzendorf struggled twelve years with no results, save that he saw its error. According to Pietism and Lutheran orthodoxy an essential element of repentance was fear of God's wrath and eternal punishment. Zinzendorf went much deeper. He taught that sin was to be regarded in two ways. On the one hand it is a debt, a burden, a torment. On the other it is an act that is not pleasing to God. Most persons regarded it in the former light and have a selfish fear of damnation and do not become converted because they hate the sinful act itself. Zinzendorf claimed that real repentance was brought about not by the law, but by the gospel, more exactly, by the sum total of the gospel, by Christ's sufferings. Pietism called the sinner to the struggle of repentance. Zinzendorf pointed him directly to the Saviour and his grace. However, in emphasizing the gospel he underestimated the law.

The old orthodoxy found certainty of salvation in objective divine acts. Pietism laid all emphasis on feeling. Zinzendorf took a middle position and united the elements of truth in both tendencies.

In the April number of the "*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*," Ihmels, of Erlangen, publishes a lecture which essays to answer the question: "How Do We Become Certain of Christian Truth." It is of particular interest because it comes from the newest professional advocate of the so-called Erlangen theology.

This question concerning the reality of the truths of Christianity is the chief hindrance that confronts Christian students of to-day. The time is forever past when certainty was handed down as an inheritance from generation to generation. The Reformation sprang from the question concerning the personal certainty of salvation. The two questions are closely related, and it is plain that the only way that leads to a certainty of Christian truth is the same way by which God leads us to a certainty of salvation. Luther saw clearly that new answers must be given to both questions. In reality the answer to this burning question of to-day is only a further development of what Luther suggested.

It follows from the very nature of Christianity. For Christian truth is not a conglomerate of doctrines. It is rather the facts of God's revelation. "In a word, the Christian certainty of truth is certainty in regard to the reality of fellowship with God as it is revealed through Christ." It necessarily follows that personal experience alone can open the way to this certainty. Without this experience I may know of the fellowship, but I cannot know it. Schleiermacher laid the foundation for this when in 1799 he declared that religion was an "immediate experience of the Divine." It is true that he went to extremes and gave up too much of the positive content of Christianity. "This entire attempt to answer the above question is undertaken on the basis of the definite presupposition that there is objective Christian truth with which Christianity stands or falls." We can learn from Schleiermacher that subjective certainty of that truth can be attained only by religious experience. "The facts of revelation are available to us only in the testimony of the bearers of revelation as it is fixed in Scripture and lives on in the Church." Thus it is plain that historical criticism has much to do with our certainty. But it cannot give us the ultimate ground. "The word of God, whether fixed in Scripture or living in the Church, testifies of itself. It is God himself that in this word forces himself upon man and testifies of himself in such a way that man ventures to believe the word that came to him to be the word of God." This occurs through the

agency of the Holy Ghost, who brings to the individual the revelation once given to humanity. "As the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom God's revelation came to its close, is still ever present in the Holy Spirit in the Church, so, in turn, it is the only office of this Holy Spirit to glorify Christ out of this word and to bring him so near to hearts that they become certain of this word and thereby certain of the revelation of God." God himself overcomes our doubt, works faith in us and makes us certain in regard to the truth which he himself is.

"This knowledge is emancipating, but on the other hand, it is, of course, no less serious. For it follows that religious certainty of truth can be present only with those who wish to experience the secret of religion itself. Thereby the way to certainty of truth becomes necessarily serious as religion itself is serious." It is the crucified Saviour through whom God comes into fellowship with us. But all this depends upon our knowledge of sin. Through this alone we can come to certainty in regard to the crucified and resurrected Son of God. "The way to Christian certainty can be described only by starting from the peculiar object with which it has to deal." But after that has been done, there is a certain resemblance between it and the way to knowledge in general.

In so far as this certainty of truth is conditioned by personal experience it is conditioned by the will. All depends upon whether the individual is receptive to the witness that God gives of himself. Yet we dare not regard the theoretical assurances of truth as superfluous. Just as the working of the Holy Ghost demands a certain psychological mediation, so the natural confirmation of truth has a meaning for the genesis of faith. In the presence of doubt a Christian may for a moment be compelled to retreat to his experience of certainty. "But it is an emergency and cannot last. The need of unity in our knowledge necessarily demands a solution of such a contradiction." The chief thing is that man holds himself open to receive the witness that God gives of himself in days of trial and in the voice of conscience, and above all, in the historically given revelation. He must hear and read God's word. But the objec-

tion is raised that scientific considerations prevent an unbiased use of the word. Such considerations and doubts should not be put down by force. We should strive to solve them. But we can demand of a man that he do not allow them to restrain him from letting God's word testify of itself. If some things are not clear it is certain that enough are clear of which the Holy Ghost can testify. In fact, all depends upon whether the individual really begins to let God's word work upon him and then also earnestly to translate into life all the knowledge that God gives him. It is plain that in the final issue all depends upon the will. Jno. 7 : 17.

The first thing that God will call forth in man by his revelation is prayer, which cannot be overemphasized. Only by prayer can we grow into fellowship with our Father.

It may be objected that the certainty thus attained is wholly subjective. But all certainty is necessarily ultimately subjective. Christian certainty, though not shared by all, when present is necessarily more certain than other knowledge, because it is so inseparably interwoven with the personality of man. A man can think as he chooses concerning things in the external world, and his personality remains untouched. But it is different with moral and religious truth. Christian certainty is, in the stricter sense, self-certainty. The Christian first really finds himself when he finds God.

The above does not offer a proof for those who are outside of Christianity. In fact a conclusive proof cannot be given for those who want to remain at a distance from God and his word. "Christian certainty of truth is simply certainty of faith and must so remain." But he who has it knows that it is not imagination when the apostle in the evening of his life said, "I know whom I have believed."

In June and July numbers of the *Theologische Rundschau*, Prof. Baldensperger, of Giessen, writes of "Recent Investigations Concerning the Son of Man." Students have been trying to get back to the historical content of the name, but the results,

thus far attained, differ so widely that an agreement seems to be farther away than ever.

Formerly the work was limited to an exegetical investigation of the Greek title, with little reference to the passage in Daniel. The common conclusion was, that by its use Jesus would express his relation to man. About twenty years ago investigators began to seek the meaning of the title from the passage in Daniel and contemporary Jewish literature. Then they sought it in pre-Christian literature and at length men began to note its messianic eschatological character. This was followed by the Aramaic stage of the discussion, which attempted an interpretation by translating the term out of the Greek into the language of Christ and his apostles. In Arabic there is no distinction between "the Son of Man" and "the man." Therefore as used by Christ it had no messianic meaning. Different writers of this class give it different meanings at different places, such as, man in general; Mark 2 : 28. At another place, Math. 11 : 19, it is equivalent to "some one." And still others make it synonymous with the first personal pronoun. Luke 6 : 22, Math. 16 : 13. The debate that has been going on has made it plain that the decision depends largely upon the general conception of the person of Christ that is entertained by the individual. It all depends upon whether a man recognizes the Messiahship of Jesus as an historical element, the center of his inner life, or as a mere accident. It is gratifying to know that Harnack in his most recent book takes a very decided stand in defense of full messianic meaning of the title.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, who died in Germany the latter part of August was one of the most erratic thinkers the world has ever produced. He was born near Leipzig in 1844, was educated at Bonn and at the early age of 25 became professor of classical philology at the University of Basle. The closing years of his life were spent in an asylum, after, as has been caustically suggested, perhaps with only too much truth, his insane philosophy had driven him insane.

His writings are not numerous and are characterized by a

very superior diction and a revolutionary mode of thought that denies all that is taught and believed. In the decade between 1885 and 1895 many ardent admirers and zealous defenders of him and of his works appeared, and a voluminous literature sprung up about his name; but of late a reaction seems to have set in, and almost all publications that appear at the present time are severely critical. His classical German attracted many young students who later saw his folly in spite of its nice linguistic dress. He was a mad, raving egotist, who would give the world a cut-throat philosophy of nonsense and a non- and anti-moral system of ethics. To him Kant was a clever fool. Schopenhauer was a wise man, whom he himself resembled. His ethics and religion, if there was any, were founded on a sort of cult of genius. His system has been called a "Lord and Slave Morality." Development by the survival of the fittest is the law of the universe; therefore we should not save the weak. Let pestilence and famine and war rage. It is right, for the fittest will survive. The genius is over all and all who are below him are his slaves to the end that he may become more highly developed. He looked upon the Christian religion as the worst religion the world had and our Christian civilization as mere barbarism. Ritschl and Grimm, in their recent pamphlets touching his work, see practically no service in his life, save that of a negative character.

Prof. Ziegler, of Strassburg, chose as the theme of his inaugural address as Rector of the University, "Faith and Knowledge." The relation is very complicated and is sometimes contradictory and hostile. But we cannot set it aside, as did Tertullian, by saying: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" because there is a certain amount of knowledge in faith, and the student must make faith an object of his thought. Pfennigsdorf sums up Ziegler's solution somewhat as follows:

According to him Schleiermacher gave the solution of the conflict between knowledge and faith. All attempts to raise faith up to knowledge, somewhat "in the form of conceptions," as Hegel has attempted, are untenable and only injure the author-

ity of faith. It is not a thing of the understanding, but of the inner life. The judgments of faith are judgments of feeling, dictated by feeling and exercising a devotional influence upon inner life. The objects of faith are supersensible and therefore cannot be proven (Kant). Faith and knowledge are wholly different as to foundation and method. In order to express itself in regard to the world and life and to formulate its doctrines faith needs the existing knowledge and means of knowledge that are found in contemporary philosophy and history. Note, for example, the amalgamation of the Christian faith with elements of the Greek philosophy. Faith, which, according to its essence, is conservative, holds tenaciously to that which it once accepted. Science, on the other hand, engaged in ceaseless change and transformation, no longer recognizes those elements. Here the strife begins, in which faith grows so easily intolerant and science so easily arrogant. "The flames of the fagot-heaps on which Giordano Bruno in Rome, or Michael Servet in Geneva, gave up their lives as martyrs for science, are just as hard to forget as the wounding, harsh words of a science that has become materialistic, concerning an implicit faith that is conservative."

Scientific theology is to undertake mediation in this conflict. It will not deny the contradiction nor soften it down to the advantage of either side, but it will prove it to be unavoidable. Thus it will remove from the struggle the sting of malevolence and help us to a reconciliation of that contradiction, which, at the present time, as a disturbing factor, is interwoven in the life of the individual as well as in that of the entire people.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Ethics and Revelation. By Prof. H. S. Nash, Price \$1.50.

This book by Prof. Nash seems to comprise a series of six lectures, prepared by him under the auspices of *The John Bohlen Lectureship*, of continuous drift in purport and discussion with the subject of the first lecture of the series, *Ethics and Revelation*. The reader soon discovers that they are all in the line of what Prof. Nash had to say, in his book entitled, *Genesis of the Social Conscience*, which arrested the attention of the thinking community as one of "the world's stock of good books," and secured for the author an acknowledged place of pre-eminence among those dealing with the "social problem," as we call it—a bundle of interests which takes in everything of importance in the social life of our modern time.

We had scarce ceased reading that book, when this other comes to us, with the proffer of additional help, in the way of elucidating, more at large, certain great matters which could only look at us from distant points of suggestion in that first book. As if it should say: Now that we know how the social conscience developed through the pagan and Christian civilizations, arriving at last at a conception of the "universal individual," and the democracy in which that idea must incorporate itself, and through which it must work to the enfranchisement of the lowest man, it behooves us to look, more in detail, at what the Bible and the Church had to do with this, especially as the whole sociological problem has fallen into scientific hands, and science and revelation have been acting shy of one another through all these years. Having in a most masterly way illustrated the spiritual significance of history in the discovered moral value of "individuality,"—considered, of course in the light of its universal human and divine implications, justifying the author in saying: "There is nothing good but individuality"—this work done, very naturally the next thing to be looked after, as having all along intruded its claim, was "to show that the Bible marks out the road along which conscience must travel, if it would treat our life on earth with abiding seriousness."

The burden of the new task, it will be seen at once, must be to adjust our Christian apologetics to the attitude of the representative outside modern man—the scientist, into whose hands the social problem has fallen. In the outburst of modern physical discovery, the material universe, for a time, quite covered the entire disk of the scientist's

vision, and he was disposed to be merry over the final disappearance of that "other world" so long dominating the mind of christendom in monastic dreams. His only gospel was the economics of the industrial era, and the only miracles he was in a mood to recognize, were the wonders that were daily breaking out all round the horizon of physical research. Metaphysics, philosophy, religion, he would have none of these. By and by he began to see that the larger reality with which he could have to do—conditioning the splendid discoveries he was making in the material world—was the free state, the safe society in which his thinking must be done. At that point the individuality of man, and the significance of history came to view, and after coquetting, for a time, with the unknowable, and its shadow of a shadow, agnosticism, as a religion, he frankly throws off these disguises, and takes the universe at the full measure of seriousness its mystery would require. Our modern representative man, as the Christian apologete finds him, is in search of a religion, as the necessary complement of the problem he has to solve. In history, in society, in the free state, he has discovered the stupendous fact of individuality, the ethical will, conscience, the ideas of right and justice, the fundamental reality on which society rests. And since all this, not to go outside of the visible universe, is but the "universal individual," or ethical will, coming into realization in history, and since the "total of science is an organism," the scientist comes to religion in the discovery, that every human being as a person possesses the infinite value of kinship with an eternal and common good.

Then comes the chapter on Comparative Religions—a masterly treatment—with reference to the principle of individuality, in which an inquiry is set up as to the competing claims of the great ethnic religions toward satisfying the scientific craving in this direction, effectually shutting off pantheism and Buddhism, because of their inadequate conception of individuality. "The scientist must view the principle of individuality as striking its root deep down into the fundamental being. The conception of ultimate being as personal, in its main intent, goes to this and no other conclusion. Whatever vulgar uses it has been put to in the past, whatever difficulties beset it in the present, this is the pith and marrow of it. The personality of God means that the substantial, the eternal good of the universe, are at the service of the principle of individuality; and that the universe does not keep in store for us a tragic disillusionment." The apologete proceeds to commend Christianity to science, as the religion fully measuring up to the new sense of the "seriousness of the universe," which is the distinctive acquisition of our modern time. We would like to believe that materialism has so far faded from the creed of our leading scientists, as to make the overture easy. The scientists are in quest of a religion, no doubt. They themselves, through the science of language and comparative religions, have demonstrated that religion is an essential element of

human nature, or, as the author would say, of individuality, which is the exhaustive good of the universe. But that they are in the mood of mental readiness to make Christianity the religious complement of their scientific habit of mind, is as yet an open question, although it must be conceded that the manifest trend of science is hopefully that way.

The whole discussion comes to a head in the last two chapters, "*Prophecy and History*," and "*The Christ and The Creative Good*." No such splendid contribution to Christian apologetics has hitherto been made. The distinctive teaching of Christianity, the incarnation, as an historical fact, rationally accepted as the one event round which the whole creation moves—on this the whole discussion must turn. The divine personality must be shown to be communicable, if men are to share in the eternal good. Creation whispers this: the incarnation sounds it alone. "The belief in creation, and the attendant belief in an authoritative social conscience, set us in an expectant attitude regarding the fact of the incarnation. The New Testament commends Christ as the answer to the problem of conscience." It is impossible to convey to the reader any adequate idea of the originality and power of Prof. Nash's way of interlacing the vast themes of our Bible revelation with the movements of the social conscience—in this second-hand way. The book itself must be thoughtfully read and re-read, under the light of that imaginative glow of historic insight in which it was written.

Prof. Nash writes on these subjects in a highly luminous and strikingly suggestive and stimulating style. There are no tricks of rhetoric, no traces of a compulsory avoidance of the commonplace; everywhere he is clearly himself a "merchant of light." He is not discursive, and so far may be difficult reading to men of that habit of mind. He hovers over an idea as a bee hovers over a honey-cell, extracting its essence by successive soundings, and halting long enough to enjoy each draught in its enveloping sphere of fragrant air. We must take note of this, because a little while ago a complaint came from one of the leading literary critics of this country, that there was an alarming dearth of good, or even tolerable, writing, among all branches of the literary craft. The reason assigned was, that the most active thinkers of the age are occupied on sociological themes, and that they had set the type too much after the dry and frigid formulas of science, giving little place to the imagination, and letting the warm currents of individual feeling have little or no play. The result is, great floods of valuable and learned discussion on these absorbing topics are thrown upon the world, which are unreadable, except by specialists, to whom the dust and litter of the scientific work-shop are just as interesting as the most intricate and wonderful invention awaiting their scrutiny on the stocks. It is the dead or living facts they want; stark, statistical, dry, and they suspect all amenities of expression, and coloring of style, as so much verbal surplussage, and vicious interference with the truth of things.

Prof. Nash has demonstrated that the suspicion is groundless, by admitting the high glow of imaginative feeling in his representation of historical drifts and tendencies, that are none the less exhaustive and masterful for the tasteful habiliment in which they are clothed.

W. H. WYNN.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. A Practical Exposition. By Chas. Gore, A. M., D. D., of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster, Hon. Chaplain to the Queen. Vol. II. (Chapters IX-XVI).

The favorable attention of the readers of *The Quarterly* was recently called to the first volume of this work. The excellent qualities which marked the first volume are fully maintained in this. The method of exposition—proceeding by sections, according to the Revised Version, prefacing each by an analysis or paraphrase—aptly provides for developing and fixing the doctrinal teaching and bringing to view the rich practical lessons for the Christian life. As the first volume was specially marked by its distinct exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith and the strong emphasis placed upon it as unfolding the way of salvation, the present volume is marked by its clear elucidation of the Apostle's teaching concerning the nature and scope of "election" in chapters IX and X of the Epistle. Had not St. Paul's teaching been so long and seriously misinterpreted, and the false interpretation so widely counted identical with the doctrine of Christianity itself, the present wide-spread confessional disturbance could have no place. Canon Gore has done good service in this distinct re-showing of the true sense of the apostolic teaching.

Passing on to the twelfth and following chapters, in which St. Paul proceeds to make practical application of the truths of salvation to the needs and duties of the Christian life, our author is, for the most part, equally happy in his explanations and suggestions. As was the case in the first volume, his training and position in the Anglican Church reveal themselves here and there in some distinctive types of church-view from which many readers will probably dissent, but the exposition is so enriched with passages of suggestive and pertinent Christian truth that the points of difference will be easily excused. An appendix of 39 pages of "Notes" on points touched in the body of the work, completes the valuable volume.

M. VALENTINE.

The Messages of the Apostles. By George Barker Stevens, Ph. D., D. D., Prof. of Systematic Theology, Yale. Cloth bound. 258 pp. Price \$1.00.

Number XII of the series "The Messages of the Bible," edited by Profs. Sanders and Kent.

This volume includes the apostolic discourses contained in the earlier chapters of Acts, and the canonical epistles (except the first nine and Philemon, which appeared in a former volume), arranged in an approximately chronological order. A very commendable introduction presents the historical facts concerning the early Church and its conflicts, with which one must be familiar to appreciate the writings which follow. Prefatory to the apostolic discourses, are set forth the problems which the Church had to solve; and the consequent apologetic, didactic, admonitory, and predictive elements of the first sermons. Each epistle is preceded by remarks on the authorship, date, purpose, and contents. Obscure passages and apparent contradictions, such as the teachings of Paul and James on justification, are satisfactorily explained. The messages themselves are rendered in free paraphrase. A substitute for the authorized text is not attempted; but the author endeavors to present the thought of the apostles so that it may create the impression originally intended. An appendix furnishes references for further reading. The work serves as a simple and popular commentary.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

Paul of Tarsus. Robert Bird. p. 515. Price \$2.00.

After recalling the many lives which have been written of St. Paul, one could scarcely think there was room for another. It must be admitted, however, that Mr. Bird, in this volume, has made for his book a rightful and commanding place by reason of his graphic pictures and of the group of readers he has had in view. This is not a child's life of St. Paul and it is just as far removed from a scholar's demands. It was prepared, like Mr. Bird's *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth*, to command the attention of the youth of England and to make real the life, rather than the writings of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

Three factors go to make the author an eminently successful writer for youth. His style is as simple and clear as any English we have ever read. An occasional bit of over-color is pardonable in the light of the demand of the average boy and girl of sixteen. But nowhere does the word-picture degenerate into a mist of mere color.

He is master of classical history. His easy command of all that pertains to Greek and Roman life and thought is utilized to give setting and contrast to the distinctively Hebrew thought and character of his central figure.

He is master of the topography of Greece, Italy, Asia Minor and Palestine. I confess to feeling the actual nature-atmosphere of the east more pronouncedly in reading this book than in studying any of the more profound writers upon biblical travel and exploration.

He is above all a sympathetic interpreter of Hebrew thought and Christian theology. His book does not pretend to outline the dogma of

the Apostle, but by a continuous use of his letters and apistles, by a graphic delineation of his transition from a narrow, intense Phariseeism to a broad and rich Christian experience, Mr. Bird reveals a wonderful insight into Paul's character and thought processes.

The chapters are made quite short as a constant inducement for youthful readers. The book is placed in the hands of any reading boy or girl will hold the attention with any biography of the age. Mr. Bird has certainly given us a most vivid and charming presentation of the most remarkable Jew in history.

E. H. DELK.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Postmarked "Colima." By Julia Suesserott Alleman. Cloth. 12 mo. pp. 253. \$1.25.

This book, the third of the John Rung Prize Series, has the initial advantage of a catchy title, suggesting just enough of the story to serve as a relish. It is also the keynote of the entire book, whose plot is nothing more than the history of a lost letter, and of those whose lives were affected by it.

The book is a love-story, pure and simple. It makes no claim to be anything else. The lost letter is the heroine's answer to a proposal—an affirmative answer, which would have made two lives very different if it had been received. A peculiar combination of circumstances lays the letter aside for twenty-five years, and then brings it again to light, to reunite the sundered lovers at last.

The chief merit of the story, in the eyes of those who contemplate placing it in the hands of the young people, is the use which the heroine makes of her years of waiting. She spends them in a little sea side village, doing good in a beautiful and quiet way, to the simple folks who have need of her help. No dream of a larger sphere, nor even the sincere and manly love of the young minister—whom we must be pardoned for preferring to the actual hero—can draw her away from her work of love; she grows into great sweetness of character, and is affectionately called, by the objects of her care, "St. Frances." It is a pleasant touch of human nature when, at the end of the book, the sailor lover returns at last, and she sails away with him, the woman overcoming the saint.

In general, while the book—as has been said—is from first to last a love story, it is such a one as any boy or girl may read with safety. The story of a pure and faithful love, and of a life ennobled by it, is worth the perusal of any one, young or old.

The story is pleasantly related; the style is smooth and equal, making a very readable narrative. As the tale of a long and mysterious time of hope deferred, and a reunion at middle age, after many sorrows, we should hardly expect highly-wrought scenes, or great stress of passion, but a soft minor tone, such as the writer maintains throughout.

We might wish that the scenes of foreign travel had been given more

space, or less. Many interesting details of Japanese life are given, some of them as minute as would be expected in a story entirely devoted to travel; at the same time, the very few chapters devoted to them give the impression, through the necessity of condensation, of a hastily written journal. There is scarcely room to do justice to these pleasant and instructive scenes. The same thing may be said of the voyage of Captain Howe with his "shanghaied" crew—one of the most picturesque incidents in the book, but compressed into so few paragraphs as to be rather disappointing from an artistic point of view.

On the whole, the book is one calculated to give pleasure to all who read it, and impress upon them the beauty of an unassuming life of benefaction—

"The quiet wherein whitest charity,
That loves not noisy praise, elects to dwell."

This is an old-fashioned ideal, but one that will not be out of date while Christianity exists.

It is a book for the Sunday-school and for the home, and will doubtless furnish enjoyment and profit to many readers.

MARGARET R. SEEBACH.

NEWSON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

A Modern English Grammar. By Huber Gray Buehler, English Master in Hotchkiss School.

This book is a modern and a model English grammar. The author has evidently profited by the innumerable experiments that have been made along this line. His method avoids on the one hand the dry dogmatism so long in vogue, which leaves nothing to the originality of the student, and on the other hand the equally dangerous "inductive" extreme, which assumes that the pupil's mind is sufficiently accurate and orderly to make its own generalizations. In the matter of method then the author seems to have profited by the wisdom of the past and the progress of the present and to have found the "golden mean."

The few pages of introduction are devoted to some interesting facts concerning the origin and make-up of the English language. The treatment of the subject itself starts with the "sentence." While this idea is by no means unique, it is only recently that discussion has insisted upon it as the only rational order. This order recognizes the fact that while the average pupil uses the parts of speech with considerable ease and fluency, he has little practical acquaintance with the structure and relations of sentences. The compositions of college students even abundantly verify this fact.

The definitions and explanations are remarkably clear and simple and even the dullest boy should find them interesting. The illustrations are good and many of them. Instead of the conventional sentences about the "dog" and "cat" and "little boy," they are drawn largely from the English classics and have fine literary quality in themselves.

The pupil who is thoroughly trained in this book should have not only a clear insight into formal grammar but a considerable acquaintance with many of the choicest quotations of our language.

The author has followed the method employed by him in his rhetoric in giving no sentences for correction, stress is laid on the oft-repeated use of correct forms rather than on the examination of incorrect forms of speech.

The rules of punctuation instead of being grouped by themselves at the end of the book, where they are either neglected entirely or studied out of relation to their uses are given in connection with the various topics. On the whole it is a sensible book having in it but little to criticise and many things to commend.

C. H. HUBER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Spiritual Life. Studies in the Science of Religion. By George A. Coe, Ph. D., John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in North-western University. pp. 279.

This volume will be found very instructive by those who are interested in the practical problems of the Christian life. The *raison d'être* of the book is expressed by the author in his preface by saying that "a new intellectual attitude is necessary with respect to the facts of the spiritual life. The religious processes taking place around us and within us must be observed with all the precision that modern psychological methods and tools render possible."

To those who object to finding uniformities in religious experiences the author says: "Religion is at least a mass of ascertainable states of consciousness; and in the absence of information to the contrary we must presume that such states can be analyzed and described, and that their relations to one another and to the recognized laws of the mental and bodily life can be to some extent determined."

The book is an earnest protest against the unintelligent application of religion to the diversified needs of human nature. It claims, that which many acknowledge but few keep in mind, that temperament is a mighty factor in practical religion, and that religious workers are successful in proportion to their grasp of the temperamental peculiarities of those with whom they deal. In fact, the sub-title of the book might well be "A study of temperaments."

The table of contents will give a hint of Dr. Coe's method of treatment, and intimate some of the practical excellences of the book. It runs as follows: "The psychological point of view;" "A study of religious awakening;" "A study of some adolescent difficulties;" "A study of religious dynamics;" "A study of divine healing;" "A study of spirituality. To this are added two appendixes of much suggestive and practical value—A. Questionnaire on religious experiences; B.

Plan for the observation of temperament. They will be found useful as they stand.

Those who read the book will not regret the time spent in the operation. They will find many new and valuable suggestions, and, to the majority, a new stand-point of religious observation and practical work, will be presented.

JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Schriftgemaesse und Erbauliche Erklarung der Offenbarung St. Johannis. Von G. Gözwein. 1900.

It is not the intention of the author to offer to the Church, in the above work a strictly exegetical commentary, nor to enter into an exhaustive and minute consideration of the figures and symbols of the Book of Revelation, but to offer to the general reader such helps and suggestions as will enable him to read this otherwise difficult book of the sacred canon with profit and with edification.

The author's *Introduction* covers some sixteen pages, and to our mind is the most interesting and scholarly part of the entire work. In it the subjects of authorship, authenticity and canonicity receive due consideration. Each of these subjects is treated in a lucid and scholarly manner. The citations from the Church-Fathers are extensive, and in the matter under consideration, exhaustive and conclusive.

The author fixes the date of the Apocalypse at 90-95, and urges as a reason for this the state of degeneracy into which the Church had already fallen; the fact that the Church was already persecuted, as a result of which persecution St. John was banished; and the conception of the Church as already divided into sections.

Chiliasm, the author thinks, has been read into the book rather than drawn from it. He emphasizes the thought that the "Revelation of Jesus Christ" is a bringing together, and an enlargement of all previous revelation, and hence all symbolical figures, and visions and conceptions of O. T. prophecies are continually reappearing in new conceptions, forms, and combinations in this book of the sacred canon. By being "in the spirit" we are reminded of Ezekiel 37: 1, Daniel 10. The seven lamps as symbols of the seven churches find their prototype in the golden candlestick with its seven lamps, Ex 25: 31, *et. seq.* The description of one "coming in the clouds;" of a girdle: of hair like wool; feet like brass; eyes of fire, point to the prophecies of Daniel. The Messianic pictures of Isaiah of the "root of David," "branch," "shoot," are here reproduced. The echo of primitive prophecy is heard in the "line of the tribes of Judah."

To prove the Johannean authorship of the Apocalypse the author relies chiefly on the internal evidences, claiming that the difference of style between this book and the Gospel of John must be accounted for by the difference of subject. Writing a revelation akin to, but more exalted than the O. T. prophets, John himself a Hebrew, reverts to

Hebraistic style. The resemblance in style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel is averted to, and a very ingenious argument deduced.

The usual division of the book into seven parts is presented, each part or division representing an epoch in the historical progress of Christ's kingdom on earth. It is claimed that the history of salvation, is to a great extent governed by numbers, but the reader is cautioned not to attempt too much in his endeavour to interpret their chronological significance. These numbers and figures should be studied reverently, and not to gratify curiosity.

It may be, that the conceded value of the *Introduction*, has led us to expect too much from the author's comments on the text. The later, we fear, the general reader will find somewhat disappointing. We readily admit that a writer on the apocalypse must be allowed some liberty in the interpretation of difficult passages, as long as he remains on safe evangelical ground, and we are loath therefore, to criticise harshly some peculiar interpretations of the author, but we are quite sure that he has shed no additional light on the text, and in numerous instances has beclouded the same with an unnecessary profusion of words and quaint-ideas. Then again, the author detracts from the general value of his work by the employment of a style that to us seems too belligerent, denunciatory and uncharitable in a work of this kind. We have room but for a few specimens:

The Star, Chap. 9 : 1, "is the Pope." The locusts, 9 : 3, are the cardinals, bishops, prelates, priests, monks, nuns, etc.; lazy, devouring, who befool (beschmeizen) that which is green and thriving; good for nothing but to coo, hum and whiz in others' ears, and their entire shaven cabal of choirasses can do nothing but bleat and howl for the belly-fodder (bauch-futter) in the pastures and meadows of their monasteries and cloisters.

The Prussian Union is "a trick of the old Serpent, hatched out by the Balaam-prophets of the king." p. 68.

"No heavenly prison—a fabrication of Calvin, contains the Son of Man, and no balloon (Luft-Schif) of the fanatics ascends up to him." p. 51.

"The union churches of our country fatten on the unclean apostates, who refuse the discipline of the Spirit in doctrine and life." p. 55.

But enough of this. We submit, this is not interpreting the Scriptures. Such language has no business in a book purporting to be a "Scriptural and Edifying" exposition of a portion of the Divine Word. Fulmination is not argumentation, and the above is but a sample of the "stock in trade" of a certain class of religious writers whose shade, we hope, for the good of the Church, and the glory of God, is becoming beautifully less.

R. H. CLARE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Notices of the *Atlantic Monthly* necessarily have a certain sameness

about them—there is always so much in this magazine to praise, so little to censure. The issue for October gives no reason to depart from our usual judgment. Its contents are such as we expect in the *Atlantic*—always of high character. *Apropos* of the recent events in China a very interesting and timely article appears on "The Crises in China," by James B. Angell, President of the University of Michigan. A discussion of "Our Immigrants and Ourselves," by Kate Holladay Claghorn suggests some strong facts as reasons for considering our general belief in the evil from immigration ill-founded. "John Ruskin as an Art Critic," "Some Old-Fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education," "Finding the 1st Dynasty Kings," are among the leading articles of the month. The fiction of this number is worthy of separate mention. "The Draxon Dinners," by Charles Warren is a very artistic story; while Mary Hallock Foote in the second installment of "The Prodigal" successfully continues her treatment of a novel theme. Among the excellent poetry of the number, Paul Lawrence Dunbar contributes a short poem on "Robert Gould Shaw." Other numbers of interest and merit cannot be individually mentioned, but contain most profitable and delightful reading. The *Atlantic Monthly* in its October issue, well justifies the position it holds as distinctively a journal of culture.

21

21